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## Disadvantages

### High Oil Prices 1NC

#### Keystone will drop oil prices --- small changes results in large fluctuations

**Zubrin**, 1/16/**2012** (Robert – president of Pioneer Astronautics, member of the steering committee of Americans for Energy, How to Reduce Oil Prices, National Review, p. <http://www.nationalreview.com/blogs/print/288115>)

Looking at the data in the graph, it is clear that cap-and-trade plans, or alternative methods of carbon or fuel taxation, are not the answer. Indeed, by increasing the cost of energy, they will only make the economic situation worse. Rather, what we need is a policy that will force world oil prices down. The way to do this is to flood the world market with liquid fuel from every source available to us. It is in this light that the extreme malfeasance of the Obama administration in delaying the approval of the Keystone pipeline becomes apparent. While much has been made of the loss of 20,000 jobs building the pipeline, that is the smallest part of the matter. The real issue is that by refusing to approve the pipeline, the Obama administration is acting to block the introduction of 270 million barrels per year of Canadian oil into the world market. In doing so, the administration is acting in accord with the interests of the OPEC oil cartel, which wishes to see supplies limited so that it can maintain high oil prices at the expense of the West. At current prices of $100 per barrel, this will cause a loss to the North American economy of $27 billion per year — an amount sufficient to create 270,000 North American jobs. (Canada draws 65 percent of its imports, which amount to 31 percent of its GDP, from the United States. The two nations effectively share one economy.) Furthermore, because the amount of oil that consumers demand does not change much when the price rises or falls — i.e., the demand is “inelastic” — small changes to the supply can cause large fluctuations in price. The 2 percent temporary reduction of Middle East oil supplies caused by the disorders associated with this year’s putative “Arab Spring” caused oil prices to go up 20 percent — a ten-to-one ratio. Assuming a conservative five-to-one ratio, the 0.85 percent addition to the world’s oil supply represented by the Canadian oil could be expected to drive prices down by about $4.25 per barrel. This would save us an additional $20 billion, an amount that in theory could create 200,000 jobs.

### High Oil 2NC

#### The plan lowers oil prices. That’s the 1NC Zubrin evidence. It opens the market to millions of barrels from Canada. Demand is inelastic so small changes in supply will cause large fluctuations in prices.

#### Increased supply to the U.S. will push down global oil prices

**Alter**, 3/1/**2012** (Jonathan – Bloomberg View columnist, Keystone Pipeline brings Pain at Pump, Bloomberg, p. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-03-02/keystone-pipe-brings-pain-at-pump-few-jobs-commentary-by-jonathan-alter.html>)

That oversupply, which holds down prices, is a result of more oil flowing south from Canada into Midwestern refineries. (It used to flow north from the Gulf region, which was more expensive.) The Canadians “propose building the Keystone line to go around Midwest refineries,” says Philip Verleger, an oil industry consultant and professor at the University of Calgary. John Kilduff, an oil analyst at Again Capital, reminds me that eventually the supply bottlenecks (most famously in Cushing, Oklahoma) will ease, the oil will flow, and sharply increased supply from Canada will push down global oil prices.

### High Gas Bad DA 1NC

#### **Keystone increases gas prices**

Schilling 6/20/2012 (Vincent, award winning native American journalist, NRDC Report: Keystone XL Pipeline Will Raise US Gas Prices, p. http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2012/06/20/nrdc-report-keystone-xl-pipeline-will-raise-us-gas-prices-2-119390)

During a press conference call on May 21, experts speaking on behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) said American drivers would face higher gas prices if the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline stretching from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico is built. The NRDC conference also released a report on the group’s analysis, entitled “Keystone XL: A Tar Sands Pipeline to Increase Oil Prices,” which is available online. In addition to the tele-conference claims made by the NRDC, TransCanada also admitted to Congress and reporters that the pipeline would increase gas prices to the Midwest and that one of the main goals is to ship refined oil from the gulf to the more lucrative overseas market. Anthony Swift, who authored the NRDC’s report said, “The pipeline’s proponents say it’s the solution to high gas prices. The truth is exactly the opposite—the pipeline would raise gas prices. This is one of the most misunderstood issues surrounding this misguided Canadian project.” In his report Swift explained that the “Keystone XL Pipeline would transport up to 830,000 barrels per day of the world’s dirtiest oil which is strip mined and drilled from under Canada’s Boreal forests, straight through the heart of America’s breadbasket to refineries on the Texas Gulf Coast. By allowing tar sands access to the lucrative international market, Keystone XL would finance further expansion of tar sands extraction, worsening climate change and undermining efforts to move to clean energy. Pipeline supporters cite high gasoline prices as a reason to build the project. The truth is that Keystone XL is likely to both decrease the amount of gasoline produced in U.S. refineries for domestic markets, and increase the cost of producing it, leading to even higher prices at the pump.” Swift said that northern Midwestern refineries produce 22 gallons of gasoline from every barrel of crude, while refineries on the Gulf Coast have produced only 17 gallons per barrel—25 percent less yield which would result in an estimated 1.2 billion gallons of gasoline per year. Ian Goodman of The Goodman Group, an economic research company, and co-author of the report, later explained another reason prices for consumer gasoline prices would rise. “Crude prices in the U.S. Midcontinent are now substantially below prices on the Gulf Coast (which reflect imports from the global oil market). In effect, the U.S. Midcontinent is getting a discount, because it is now close to the source,” he said. He said that while Alberta tar sands crude going to the Midwest is designated for American consumers in the form of gasoline, the Keystone XL Pipeline is meant to divert crude to the gulf coast for diesel production and an easier ability to export to the global market from the gulf. “So KXL will reduce gasoline supply, and it will also increase production costs for gasoline,” Goodman said. TransCanada’s 2008 Permit Application itself states “Existing markets for Canadian heavy crude, principally PADD II [U.S. Midwest], are currently oversupplied, resulting in price discounting for Canadian heavy crude oil. Access to the USGC [U.S. Gulf Coast] via the Keystone XL Pipeline is expected to strengthen Canadian crude oil pricing in [the Midwest] by removing this oversupply. This is expected to increase the price of heavy crude to the equivalent cost of imported crude. The resultant increase in the price of heavy crude is estimated to provide an increase in annual revenue to the Canadian producing industry in 2013 of US $2 billion to US $3.9 billion.”

#### High gas prices hurt the economy --- causes a decline in consumer spending and inflation

**Aversa**, April 28, **2011** ( Jeannine, associated press- CNS news, “Economy Slowed by High Gas Prices, Bad Weather”p. http://cnsnews.com/news/article/economy-slowed-high-gas-prices-bad-weather

The economy slowed sharply in the first three months of the year as **high gas prices cut into consumer spending**, bad weather delayed construction projects and the federal government slashed defense spending by the most in six years.

The Commerce Department said Thursday that the economy grew at a 1.8 percent annual rate in the January-March quarter. That was weaker than the 3.1 percent growth rate for the October-December quarter. And it was the worst showing since last spring when the European debt crisis slowed growth to a 1.7 percent pace.

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke and other economists say the slowdown last quarter is a temporary setback. They generally agree that gas prices will stabilize and the economy will grow at a 3 percent pace in each of the next three quarters.

But gas prices are still going up. The national average on Thursday was $3.88 a gallon, an increase of 30 cents from a month ago when the first quarter ended.

An inflation gauge in the report showed consumer prices rose last quarter at the fastest pace in nearly three years, with most of the increase coming from higher fuel costs.

**Rising gas prices are draining most of the extra money that Americans are receiving this year from a Social Security payroll tax cut.**

In the January-March quarter, consumers boosted spending at a 2.7 percent pace. That was down from a 4 percent pace in the prior quarter and was the weakest pace since last summer. Consumer spending is important because it accounts for roughly 70 percent of overall economic activity.

Pump prices were mostly blamed for the pullback, although harsh winter weather also kept people from shopping.

"All things considered, it could have been worse," said economist Paul Dales at Capital Economics. Even though consumers spent less, the pace of spending by historical standards is decent.

Winter storms \_ including rare snow that blanketed the South \_ also forced builders to delay construction projects, a big factor holding back overall economic activity. Builders slashed spending on commercial construction, such as office buildings and factories, at a 21.7 percent annualized pace, the deepest cuts since late 2009.

Home building also was hurt. Builders cut spending on housing projects by a 4.1 percent annualized rate.

Bernanke at a news conference on Wednesday suggested that the crippled housing market will continue to weigh on the economic recovery. He pointed out that home building and commercial construction were both "very weak" in the first quarter. Normally, construction spending is a big part of economic recoveries.

The housing market's collapse thrust the economy into a deep recession, and economists say it will take years for the industry to heal. Two years after the recession has ended, the housing market remains depressed.

That's one of the reasons why the United States is experiencing a relatively slow recovery, Bernanke explained.

Another factor holding back the economy last quarter: Deep cuts by the federal government on military projects. That spending was cut by an annualized rate of 11.7 percent, the most since the end of 2005.

Bernanke and other economists expect government defense spending and consumer spending will rebound in the next quarter.

"Most of the factors that account for the slower growth in the first quarter appear to us to be transitory," Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said at a news conference Wednesday.

Economists in a new Associated Press survey predict the economy is growing at a 3.2 percent pace this quarter and that growth will steadily improve over the remainder of the year.

An inflation gauge tied to the report showed that consumer prices rose sharply last quarter.

Prices rose at an annual rate of 3.8 percent, the most since the summer of 2008, when gasoline prices hit a record high of $4.11 a gallon nationwide. But stripping out energy and food prices, inflation rose at a rate of 1.5 percent. That's at the low end of the range of inflation the Federal Reserve believes is needed for a healthy economy.

### Gas Prices Link 2NC

#### Keystone will increase gas prices --- multiple reasons

**Casey-Lefkowitz**, 3/21/**2012** (Susan – director of the International Program for the Natural Resources Defense Council, Five reasons why Keystone XL tar sands pipeline will raise oil prices, Switchboard, p. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/sclefkowitz/five\_reasons\_why\_the\_keystone.html)

The oil industry call for fast-tracking new pipelines from the Midwest to the Gulf Coast will fast-track a rise in oil prices that is good for oil companies, but not so good for consumers. Although the White House rejected the presidential permit for the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline in January, pipeline backers have cited high U.S. gas prices as a reason to expedite pipeline approval. However, there is no credible evidence that gas prices would decline if Keystone XL were constructed. The truth is that the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline could actually add to our pain at the pump. We do not need the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline and the risks that it would bring to U.S. climate, lands and waters. Rising gas prices will not be solved by approving or expediting permits for any part of Keystone XL. The solutions lie in reducing our demand for oil, increasing fuel efficiency standards, and eliminating subsidies for the oil industry. Here are five reasons why the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline will raise oil prices: 1. Keystone XL is a tar sands pipeline through the United States, not to it. The proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline, whether seen as a whole or as a northern and southern segment, would pump some of the world’s dirtiest oil that is strip-mined and drilled from under the boreal forests of Alberta, Canada, straight through the heart of America’s breadbasket to refineries on the Texas Gulf Coast. Keystone XL won’t bring additional oil into the United States for over a decade – it just diverts oil from the Midwest to the Gulf Coast where it can be refined and exported. 2. Gulf Coast refineries have become focused on exporting refined products internationally, where prices for diesel and gasoline are higher. Even as Americans pay more for gasoline, Gulf Coast refiners are converting their operations to produce diesel for international export rather than gasoline for domestic use. These refineries provide the U.S. market with less than half of the gasoline that they did just five years ago – and that’s because they’re now exporting over 2.5 million barrels a day of diesel and gasoline to international buyers. 3. Keystone XL would increase the price of oil in the Midwest – which produces gasoline for U.S. consumers. The Midwest now provides far more gasoline for American consumers than the Gulf Coast. The flow of Canadian crude to the Midwest has lowered oil prices there by more than $10 a barrel when compared by the Gulf Coast. This helps the U.S. consumers who buy those products refined in the Midwest. Keystone XL would reverse this by diverting oil from the Midwest to Texas. Midwestern supplies would tighten. Oil economists have predicted Keystone XL could significantly increase Midwest gas prices. 4. The foreign oil corporation that wants to build the pipeline has admitted that Keystone XL is intended to increase the price of heavy crude oil in the United States. “The resultant increase in the price of heavy crude is estimated to provide an increase in annual revenue to the Canadian producing industry of US $2 billion to US $3.9 billion,” TransCanada said.

#### Keystone Will Increase Gas Prices --- market power and manipulation

McKibben, 2/21/2012 (Bill, founder of 350.org, an international climate campaign website, Keystone: the pipeline to higher gas prices, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/energy-a-environment/211733-bill-mckibben-founder-350org)

The fight over the Keystone Pipeline began in earnest last spring, when James Hansen at NASA pointed out that heavily tapping the Canadian tarsands would mean it was “essentially game over” for the climate. Since planetary destruction is what even the dimmest analyst might describe as a less than optimal policy outcome, the oil industry and its allies in Congress have since done everything they can think of to change the subject. First the pipeline became a jobs project - until the one study not funded by Transcanada showed it might kill as many jobs as it would create. Now even the pipeline company says permanent employees will number “in the hundreds.” Next it became an energy security issue - until a look at refinery contracts made clear the oil was to be refined and shipped overseas. Let me predict the next talking point right now: with gas prices rising, the pipeline will let Americans fill up for less. This is nonsense on many fronts, most of all because the price is oil is fundamentally set on global markets. As the Congressional Research Service pointed out in late January, when there’s trouble in places like the Straits of Hormuz, the price of oil goes up for everyone and Keystone will make no difference, since the oil market is “globally integrated’; it’s not like Exxon offers a home-country discount to American motorists. But in the case of the Keystone pipeline, it turns out there’s a special twist. At the moment, there’s an oversupply of tarsands crude in the Midwest, which has depressed gas prices there. If the pipeline gets built so that crude can easily be sent overseas, that excess will immediately disappear and gas prices for 15 states across the middle of the country will suddenly rise. Says who? Says the companies trying to build the thing. Transcanada Pipeline’s rationale for investors, and their testimony to Canadian officials, included precisely this point: removing the “oversupply’ and the resulting “price discount” would raise their returns by $2 to $4 billion a year. According to the National Wildlife Federation, that would translate to about $3 for an average 15-gallon fill-up - as independent energy economist Philip Verleger put it, with Keystone the industry “will be able to use its market power to raise the heavy crude price to Midwest refiners above the level that would prevail in a competitive market.” Certainly that’s been the case in the past: Stephen Kretzmann of Oil Change International recently calculated that "over the last two decades the U.S. has almost tripled the amount of Canadian oil we've imported into the US, and during that time average gasoline price has more than tripled.” The Midwest states most at risk of higher prices if Keystone is built include some of the hardest hit economically in the country: Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin. In other words, the Keystone Pipeline is among other things an attempt to manipulate prices - which may not come as too great a shock to an American public used to watching the fossil fuel industry manipulate prices.

#### **Keystone raises gas prices --- reducing supply and diversion**

Graves 5-22-12 (Lucia- political writer for the Huffington Post) http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/22/report-keystone-xl-gas-prices\_n\_1536227.html

On a conference call with reporters on Tuesday, report author and NRDC attorney Anthony Swift called the pipeline's impact on gasoline prices "one of the most misunderstood issues surrounding the proposed Keystone XL," adding that when TransCanada originally proposed the pipeline, they pitched it as a way to increase the cost of oil in the United States, providing increased revenue for Canadian producers. Since then, proponents of the pipeline in the United States have pitched it as a means of decreasing U.S. gasoline prices. Swift's study examined these two conflicting claims, and findings suggest that the former is the true one. "Our study has found that Keystone XL is likely to both decrease the amount of gasoline in U.S. refineries for domestic markets and increase the cost of producing it, leading to even higher prices at the pump," Swift told reporters. TransCanada did not immediately return a request for comment. The report found the pipeline will increase U.S. gasoline prices by three mechanisms, most immediately by reducing the amount of gasoline produced in the United States. The pipeline will divert crude oil from Midwestern refineries, which are designed to produce as much gasoline as possible from a barrel of oil, to Texas Gulf refineries, which are designed to produce as much diesel as possible from a barrel of oil. The result in the immediate to short term will be a decline in gasoline production and an increase in diesel, according to the report. Other findings in the report include that the pipeline will increase the price of crude oil in the Midwest and Rocky Mountains by over $20 a barrel, increasing the cost of Canadian tar sands by as much as $27 billion annually. These higher crude oil costs are expected to lead to deteriorating financial conditions in Rocky Mountain and Midwestern refineries, which could in turn result in decreased production. That's because if Midwestern refineries are forced to pay a higher price for oil, as East Coast refineries already do, they will be forced to respond by reducing their production and further decreasing U.S. gasoline supplies, according to the report.

#### Keystone XL causes gas prices to go up

**Swift 2012** (Anthony- Energy Analyst at the National Resource Defense Council, BA in political science and biology) “Keystone XL: A Tar Sands Pipeline to Increase Oil Prices” http://www.nrdc.org/energy/keystone-pipeline/files/Keystone-Oil-Prices-Report.pdf

Pipeline supporters cite high gasoline prices as a reason to build the project. The truth is that Keystone XL is likely to both decrease the amount of gasoline produced in U.S. refineries for domestic markets, and increase the cost of producing it, leading to even higher prices at the pump. The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline would divert oil from the Midwest to refineries on the Gulf Coast of Texas. Midwestern refineries produce more gasoline per barrel than refineries in any other region in the United States. That gasoline is then sold to U.S. consumers. In contrast, refineries on the Gulf Coast of Texas produce as much diesel as possible, much of which is exported internationally. By taking oil from midwestern gasoline refineries to Gulf Coast diesel refineries, Keystone XL will decrease the amount of gasoline available to American consumers. Meanwhile the Keystone XL pipeline will increase the price that gasoline producing refineries in the Midwest pay for crude oil. TransCanada, the company sponsoring the pipeline, pitched the pipeline to Canadian regulators as a way of increasing the price of crude in the United States. 1 Right now, Midwestern refineries are buying crude oil at a discount—a deep discount. This allows them to produce products more cheaply than they would otherwise be able to. Building Keystone XL would change that. If TransCanada’s analysis is accurate, under current market conditions, Keystone XL would add $20 to $40 to the cost of a barrel of Canadian crude—increasing the cost of oil in the United States by tens of billions of dollars. The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is not a solution to rising gas prices. By decreasing the supply of gasoline in the United States and increasing the price refineries pay to produce it, Keystone XL will add to America’s pain at the pump. The United States does not need the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline and the associated climate, land, and water risks. The solutions to our energy needs lie in reducing our demand for oil, increasing fuel efficiency standards, and eliminating subsidies for the oil industry.

### Ext – Keystone Raises Gas Prices

#### Keystone XL Hurts US Gas Prices

Kistner, 5/22/2012 (Rocky, Media Associate for NRDC, Report: Keystone Tar Sands Pipeline Will Raise Gas Prices and Cut Oil Supplies, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rocky-kistner/report-keystone-tar-sands\_b\_1536526.html)

Despite all the industry hype over jobs and purported energy security benefits from building the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline -- benefits a Brooklyn bridge-builder could propose -- a new report shows the mammoth Canadian tar sands pipeline will cut the amount of gasoline produced in the U.S. and jack up gas prices for American drivers, especially in Midwestern, Great Plains and Rocky Mountain states. That’s right, the dirty oil pipeline from Canada will not only threaten North America’s greatest drinking water sources like the Ogallala Aquifer, slashing through the fertile farmlands and cattle country of America’s agricultural breadbasket, but it will boost the price at the pump for consumers struggling to pay for gas prices near historic highs. The report, "Keystone XL: A Tar Sands Pipeline to Higher Oil Prices," lays out the facts that the oil industry doesn't want Americans to understand -- the controversial TransCanada pipeline will ding consumers at the pump and cut oil supplies whose price is now discounted in the Midwest and in the Rockies. Here’s an excerpt from the report produced by NRDC, Oil Change International and ForestEthics Advocacy; : Keystone XL will take oil currently refined in the Midwest and Rockies and send it to the Gulf Coast where it can be sold on the international market. Oil supplies dedicated to the United States will decline while the Keystone XL pipeline provides the international market with access to that Canadian crude previously meant for the U.S. market. This will have a powerful impact on oil prices in the Midwest and Rockies -- increasing the price of Canadian crude by $20 to $30 a barrel in the 2012 U.S. market, while doing nothing to decrease world oil prices. The bottom line is that Gulf refineries are clamoring for crude they can turn into diesel, the most lucrative petrochemical product right now on the international market. Here's how NRDC's Anthony Swift describes it in his recent blog; Keystone XL is going divert crude oil from the Midwest, a region of the United States where refineries are designed to produce as much gasoline as possible from a barrel of oil, to the Gulf Coast of Texas, where refineries have reconfigured themselves to produce as much diesel as possible from a barrel of crude. These differences are due to recent changes in the world market for oil and refined products. Historically gasoline commanded higher prices than diesel, driven largely by increasing U.S. consumption. That has changed over the last ten years as U.S. gasoline consumption has plateaued, due in large part to increasing automobile efficiency standards, and global demand for diesel continues to rise. Today, diesel commands a higher price than gasoline, particularly in the international market. So we're going to take oil out of Midwest refineries producing gasoline for U.S. consumers and ship it to Gulf refineries which are focused on making diesel fuel for the international market. Sound like a good deal to you? Well it doesn’t to people like Texas landowner Mike Hathorn, a welder concerned about his family’s property in his east Texas hill country home near Wells. That’s where TransCanada wants to run its 1,700 mile Keystone XL pipeline to the Gulf, straight through his family's river-fed land that he says now is threatened by a foreign corporation -- and by foreign oil. Hathorn says he's always been worried about the environmental risks the toxic tar sands brew will pose in this water-rich community. But concern over increases in gas prices is just icing on the cake to this proud Texan. “It doesn’t surprise me one bit,” Hathorn says in his thick Texas drawl. “This pipeline project isn’t helping people out here in the U.S. any. It’s just a Canadian company trying to use the U.S. as a route to get its oil out on the international market. We’re the ones having to take the risk. If it’s going to raise gas prices, then it’s just one more reason not to build it.” Check out Mike Hathorn’s video and other videos of landowners, farmers, ranchers and citizens opposed to the expansion of tar sands mining operations and pipelines at NRDC’s new website Voices Against Tar Sands. Other reporters have latched onto this oil price conundrum, too. Here’s Bloomberg columnist Jonathan Alter in a recent report: TransCanada’s plan to jack up oil prices is hiding in plain sight. In the appendix to its application to the Canadian National Energy Board (helpfully provided to me by the Natural Resources Defense Council), the company brags that its project is “expected to realize an increase in the heavy crude price of approximately $3.00 per barrel by avoiding a discount” at the U.S. Gulf Coast. The market price of heavy crudes should rise an additional $3.55 per barrel when the new pipeline “relieves the oversupply situation in the Midwest.” Of course, TransCanada made the claim in 2009, when the discounted price for Canadian crude was only $3 a barrel. In 2012, that discount has skyrocketed to between $20 to $40 a barrel. And that’s why the tar sands industry wants Keystone XL so badly -- it means adding tens of billions of dollars to the annual price of their product, billions that would be paid by you and me. These are facts that are not widely shared by the oil industry, for obvious reasons. But reporters who dig into this come up with the same conclusions: you can’t cut the price of gas Americans pay by importing more toxic tar sands oil from Canada. In fact, the reverse is true; it will boost prices we pay at the pump by creating a conduit of crude to Gulf refineries eager to turn the heavy Canadian bitumen into diesel for export -- and turn a hefty profit doing it. “Big oil and big money” is how Mike Hathorn explains it. And you can bet the American consumer -- and all who depend on a sustainable and healthy planet -- will be the last to benefit from the companies pushing this massive dirty tar sands oil pipeline plan.

#### **KXL Increases Gas Prices**

**Kohn**, 1/18/**2012** (Sally, political Commentator, Six reasons Keystone XL was a bad deal all along, p. www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along/)

Currently, Canadian oil reserves stored in the Midwest help suppress gas prices in the United States, particularly for farmers in our nation’s heartland. In its permit application for the pipeline, TransCanada noted that the Keystone XL pipeline would allow the company to drain these reserves and export that fuel as well. According to TransCanada’s own statements, this would raise gas prices in the United States, especially in the Midwest.

#### Keystone XL raises gas prices

Buchele 5-17-12 (Mose- broadcast reporter for StateImpact, Masters in journalism from UT Austin)

The debate over TransCanada’s proposed oil pipeline from the oil sands of Alberta to the Texas Gulf Coast has mostly focused on the environmental and economic impacts. People in favor say it will bring jobs and energy security. Opponents say the pipeline, and the crude it will carry, will harm the earth. But the project might have another consequence that’s been largely overlooked. Some analysts say it could actually raise gas prices for many American consumers. Here’s how. Access to crude oil is not evenly distributed. There are large sections of the country that are awash in the stuff and others that have little. These days the upper region of the American Midwest has more crude from Canada, North Dakota and Montana than refineries can handle. And a huge glut of oil called West Texas Intermediate is sitting in Oklahoma, undervalued because it can’t get to refineries. “If only there was another pipeline that would bring [the crude] to the Gulf Coast, where from Corpus Christi, Texas to the Mississippi River, there is the largest concentration of refineries in the world, ” Jim Prescott, a PR rep for TransCanada, mused during a recent phone interview. In effect, that’s exactly what the Keystone XL Pipeline would accomplish. Like the pipeline’s other supporters, Prescott says bringing that crude to refineries will increase supply and translate into lower gas prices for consumers. It’s basic supply and demand, he says. But in the world of international oil markets, things aren’t always simple. And some experts warn that moving Canadian crude to Texas will actually drive prices up where consumers benefit from over-supply. Phillip Verleger runs the Energy Consulting firm PK Verleger. Recently he’s lead the charge against the pipeline proposal not from an environmental standpoint, but because he believes it would actually be bad for the U.S. oil industry. “Proponents of the Canadian pipeline testified to the Canadian energy board, that Keystone would extract an extra six billion dollars from the upper Midwest,” he told StateImpact Texas. He says if TransCanada’s pipeline from Alberta is completed, “what you would have is consumers in Illinois, Minnesota, probably Iowa Nebraska, possibly Missouri and possibly the Dakotas paying more.” Others say the same could happen with the glut of oil in Oklahoma.

### Ext – High Prices Hurt the Economy

#### High gas prices hurt economy

**FOX news** 2/29/**2012**( U.S. Associated press of FOX news, “Will higher gas prices derail the economy?”, p. http://www.foxnews.com/us/2012/02/29/will-higher-gas-prices-derail-economy/)  
The price of gas has jumped 45 cents since Jan. 1 and is the highest on record for this time of year, an average of $3.73 a gallon. On Wall Street, talk has turned from the European debt crisis to another worry: Will higher gas prices derail the economic recovery?Not yet, economists say. They argue that the United States is in much better shape than early last year, when a similar surge in fuel prices weighed on economic growth by squeezing household budgets. Americans spent less on clothes, food and everything else.Rising gas prices **hurt** less when an economy is improving than when it's slowing down. So economists expect other spending won't be badly hurt, at least for now. If gas breaks its record of $4.11 a gallon, however, all bets are off."Can the economy withstand the increase we've seen so far? The answer is yes," says David Kelly, chief market strategist at J.P. Morgan Funds.The reasons: Jobs. The country has added 2 million over the past year. Those 2 million people with paychecks will spend them, which helps the economy. Lower unemployment also makes people feel better about the economy — and less likely to cut other spending way back.Job security. Unemployment claims, the best measure of layoffs, are at a four-year low. Fewer Americans are worrying about losing their job, so they can take the punch of higher gas prices and move on.A steadier housing market, the Dow Jones industrial average's clearing 13,000 and other signs of an improving economy also help. Add them together and consumer confidence is the highest in a year. More confidence makes people more likely to keep spending on other things even if gas goes up."The public will howl as we approach $4 gas, but they will probably continue to increase spending," says Carl Riccadonna, a senior economist at Deutsche Bank.Gas wasn't the only thing getting more expensive last year. Prices for milk, meat, bread and other foods were rising because of higher prices for grains and other farm goods. Natural gas prices were also on the rise, making it more expensive for Americans to heat their homes.This year, natural gas prices have plummeted. Unlike like year, filling up the car's tank is about the only thing getting dramatically more expensive. Last year, when Americans were feeling it from all sides, they made tough choices, like cutting out expensive dinners. The increase in the price of gas has been more gradual this year, which could make it easier on the psyche of the American consumer. Last year, prices at the pump rose from $2.78 to a peak of $3.98 in mid-May. The national average for a gallon of regular on Wednesday was $3.73, up from $3.28 at the start of the year.The key is what impact gas prices have on other spending in the economy. All consumer spending isn't equal. A dollar spent on gas has less of an impact on the U.S. economy than a dollar spent in a restaurant or at a baseball game. The U.S. is an oil-importing country, so many of the dollars spent on gas ultimately leave the country.The rule of thumb among economists is that a 25-cent increase in gas knocks $25 billion to $30 billion off consumer spending in a year and lowers economic growth by 0.2 percentage points, says Carl Riccadonna, senior economist at Deutsche Bank.The price of gas averaged $3.51 last year, so a move above $4 should only divert $60 billion from consumer spending this year, Riccadonna says. Last year, it drained an estimated $120 billion."It's really a two-horse race," Riccadonna says. "There's rising energy costs, and then there is households' ability to handle those rising costs."So far, households appear to be keeping up. Economists think the economy will grow at a 2.2 percent annual rate in the first half of this year, compared with 0.9 percent while gas prices crept up in the first half of last year.

### High Gas Impact – Elections

#### High gas prices hurt Obama’s re-election Handley 2/6/ 2012 ( Megan, U.S News political correspondent, “Pain at the pump could mean pain at the polls for President Obama”, p. http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/02/06/could-high-gas-prices-hurt-obamas-reelection-campaign)

Now that the unemployment rate is marching downward, the GOP might have to find another economic woe to harangue President Obama about. If they look to their local gas pump, they could be in luck. Thanks to tensions in the Middle East and refinery closures stateside, experts are projecting gasoline prices to jump 60 cents by Memorial Day. That's on top of an 11-cent spike over the past four weeks on the already sky-high gas prices Americans saw in January, the highest on record. Experts say prices could even jump to $5 per gallon in cities such as New York and Chicago, and that pain at the pump **could translate into some pain at the polls for Obama**. Some GOP contenders have already keyed into the issue of gas prices and how acutely consumers feel upticks in fuel costs. When she was still campaigning for the GOP nomination, Michele Bachmann promised to bring back $2-a-gallon gasoline. That might sound crazy when looking at average gas prices today, which currently hover around $3.48, but take a trip down memory lane and prices weren't far away from the $2 mark. Over the past several years, gas prices have hit increasingly high starting points at the beginning of the year. On Dec. 31, 2008, average gas prices were around $1.61 per gallon, says Gregg Laskoski, senior petroleum analyst at GasBuddy.com. On the same date in 2009, they were up to $2.64. Flash forward to last month, and prices hit $3.25 going into 2012. Some of the price movements are expected in the run-up to the summer months, Laskoski says, primarily because refiners have to reformulate gasoline to include eco-friendly fuel additives. On average, the spread between prices from Dec. 31 to peak are around 93 cents, he says. Adding that to $1.61 per gallon might not feel too bad to consumers, but when tacking it on to $3.25, consumers can start to feel squeezed. Budget-constrained consumers stop spending, which can be disastrous for the United States, which relies heavily on consumer spending to fuel its economy. For the time being, the GOP isn't likely to back off its criticism of the high unemployment rate. But rising gas prices offer easy fodder and could cast a shadow on an increasingly bright employment picture for Obama. "It's something they're definitely going to talk about, because anything that's bad for the economy, Republicans will try to attach to Obama," says Danny Hayes, assistant professor of government at American University. "It's an easy target that people see every day when they're paying $40, $60, $80 at the pump."

**High gas prices will hurt Obama’s re-election**

**Kim** 2/ 28/ 20**12** (Seung, a reporter for POLITICO, “Steny Hoyer: Gas prices could hurt Obama”, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0212/73385.html

House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer says he’s concerned that rising gas prices will hurt President Barack Obama and fellow Democrats politically. The House’s No. 2 Democrat said Tuesday that much like former President George W. Bush was blamed for high gas prices during the last administration, Obama could face political pain as consumers continue doling out more cash to fill up their cars. “They’re not at historic high levels at this point in time,” Hoyer, referring to current gas prices, told reporters on Tuesday. “But they are high and, yes, I’m concerned — and, yes, I’m concerned about the impact it has on the administration.” The average gas price is $3.72 per gallon, according to the AAA. Republicans have pounced, trying to pin escalating prices on the Democratic White House and its energy policies. “Make no mistake: The rising price of gasoline isn’t simply the result of forces we can’t control,” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell said on the Senate floor Tuesday. “It is, to a large extent, the result of a vision that this president laid out even before he was elected to office.” Meanwhile, House Speaker John Boehner wrote a letter to Obama Tuesday, calling for an “all-of-the-above” energy policy. “Over the last three years, your administration has blocked, slowed and discouraged the production of critical American energy sources,” Boehner wrote. “These actions are bad for energy prices and bad for jobs. ”Hoyer countered that speculation in the oil markets and continuing unrest in the Middle East — not a shortage of supply — are pushing gas prices upward.

#### Rising gas prices KILL Obama reelection

**The Week**, MARCH 13, **2012** (The Week, How badly will rising gas prices hurt Obama? <http://theweek.com/article/index/225504/how-badly-will-rising-gas-prices-hurt-obama> Washington Post.)

President Obama's approval numbers have dropped to an all-time low, plummeting to 41 percent in a new CBS/New York Times survey. (Last month, that poll had Obama at 50 percent.) At the same time, an increasing number of voters disapprove of Obama's approach to rising gas prices. According to a new Washington Post/ABC News poll, 65 percent of Americans disapprove of Obama's handling of America's pain at the pump, compared to just 26 percent who give him a passing grade. These polls seem to reverse a trend that had seen Obama's numbers climb thanks to steadily improving employment figures and other indications of economic recovery. If prices at the pump keep rising, are Obama's re-election hopes doomed?

#### Low gasoline prices are key to Obama winning the election

**Raum** 04/30/**12**, (Tom – Reporter since 1973- Huffington Post, Gas Prices Drop Could Benefit Obama Re-Election Hopes, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/30/gas-prices-obama-reelection-2012\_n\_1465165.html)

You wouldn't know it from campaign rhetoric, but gasoline prices have been trending down. Six months out, polls show the presidential race is very close and that the frail economy and jobs still top voter worry lists. Thus even a small drop in gas prices could generate big political ripples. Generally, any slide in gas prices should benefit President Barack Obama more than presumptive GOP challenger Mitt Romney, and vice versa. After flirting with $4 a gallon earlier this spring, the recent national average of $3.83 a gallon is down eight cents from a month ago The drop hasn't registered politically yet. Each party is blaming the other for high pump prices. Republicans fault Obama for policies they claim are restricting U.S. oil production and pushing up energy costs, including his blocking the Keystone XL Canada-to-Texas oil pipeline. They also say he's taking credit for production increases that owe much to his Republican predecessor, George W. Bush. "No matter how Obama spins it, gas costs too much," says an ad by Crossroads GPS, a Republican super PAC. Romney laments that gas prices just "go higher and higher" under the Democratic president. Obama wants to give regulators more muscle to deter price manipulation by speculators, whom he says "can reap millions while millions of American families get the short end of the stick." He also blasts GOP opposition to ending tax breaks for oil and gas companies. Gas prices are falling partly because slowing economic growth in the U.S. and China and ongoing debt woes in Europe are easing demand for petroleum products. Also, cars are more fuel efficient and Americans are driving less. Gasoline on average is still 55 cents higher than it was on Jan. 1. But in politics as in economics, the trend can be the friend.

### Elections Link

#### Keystone will be a highlight of the election

**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.

#### Building Keystone would alienate environmentalist --- a key part of Obama’s base

**Schnur**, 4/9/**2012** (Dan – director of the Jesse M. Unruh Institute Politics at the University of Southern California, The President, Gas Prices and the Pipeline, New York Times, p. http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/09/the-president-gas-prices-and-the-keystone-pipeline/)

Where the issue becomes more tangible and therefore trickier for Obama is when the multiple choices become binary. The debate over the proposed XL Keystone Pipeline that would transport Canadian oil through the nation’s heartland to the Gulf of Mexico crystallizes the choices involved and forces a shades-of-gray conversation into starker hues of black and white. Obama recognizes that the devoted environmentalists who represent a critical portion of the Democratic party base need some motivation to turn out for him in the fall. But he also understands that centrist voters who support him on a range of other domestic and foreign policy matters could be lured away by a Republican opponent who either promises relief at the gas pump or who can lay blame at the White House doorstep for those higher prices. Even more complicated is the role of organized labor, which has poured immense amounts of support into Obama’s re-election but also prioritizes the job-creation potential of the pipeline.

### Ext – Keystone Kills Environmentalist Support

#### Keystone approval will crush environmentalist support

**CNN iReport**, 2/9/**2012** (Keystone XL Pipeline Alive in Congress with Bipartisan Support, p. <http://ireport.cnn.com/docs/DOC-744727>)

The Keystone XL pipeline project is far from dead in the US Congress. The controversial project is much on the minds of not just Republican, but also Democrat lawmakers. Though many had hoped that the issue was dead or at least in hibernation until after the November presidential election, environmentalists may have to rethink their celebration. It is expected that once the election is over the pipeline will get the green light over the objections of environmentalists. Many believe the only reason the pipeline was sidetracked by the Administration was to keep enviromentalists on President Barack Obama's team through November. A plan to fast-track the stalled Keystone XL oil pipeline was passed by a key committee in the House of Representatives, as Republicans made yet another attempt to spur approval of the project that has become a major issue in the 2012 elections.

### Environment Key to Obama Election

#### **Environmental Issues will be key in the upcoming election**

**Susan** 4-27-**12** http://www.helium.com/items/2321491-issues-that-will-affect-the-2012-presidential-race

Indeed environmental issues will be a key debate topic in the upcoming election, and President Obama just may find that his weak National Defense stance along with his obsessive energy stance just may lead to his demise just as it did with President Carter. If it is true history repeats itself, the 2012 Presidential Election just may see another Electoral Landslide as in 1980. All is fair in love, war, and politics, and "We as a Nation" may be poised and ready for just such a happening.

#### Environmentalists key to Obama

**Ungar** 1-21-**12** (Amiel- Ph.D. in political science)

http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/151939#.T-tn\_LXY\_y0

President Barack Obama had sought to delay judgment on the approval of the Keystone XL pipeline project for carrying tar sands oil from Alberta in Canada down to the Gulf Coast refineries.

Obama realized that this was a wedge issue for the Republicans. The environmentalists, a key component of the Obama coalition, strongly opposed the pipeline because they feared an environmental disaster and objected to the exploitation of tar sands as a source of energy.

#### Environmentalists key to Obama

**Peek** 1-19-**12** (Elizabeth T.- 20 years as an analyst on Wall Street, first woman president of the National Society of Petroleum Investors)

http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Columns/2012/01/19/Obama-Kills-Oil-Pipeline-in-Bow-to-Green-Lobby.aspx#page1

How many votes does President Obama hope to win from environmentalists? More, apparently, than from construction workers. That would appear to be the calculus behind the decision of the White House to deny approval of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, which has been vehemently opposed by environmentalists, a key Obama constituency. A constituency, it should be said, whose enthusiasm has waned as the president failed to deliver on cap-and-trade and, more recently, prevented EPA head Lisa Jackson from imposing draconian new ozone limits. The administration had already punted on the hot-button Keystone project, deferring a decision until after the 2012 election, but Congress included a provision in the recent payroll tax agreement that forced Obama’s hand, demanding an up or down decision by February 21.

### Politics Link – Agenda

#### Keystone is a partisan issue --- causes massive fights

**Clayton**, 3/9/**2012** (Mark – staff writer for the Christian Science Monitor, How much would Keystone pipeline help US consumers, MSNBC, p. http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/46689167/ns/us\_news-christian\_science\_monitor/t/how-much-would-keystone-pipeline-help-us-consumers/#.T-pMTbVYt2A)

Often lost in the political wrangling over the controversial Keystone XL pipeline – on hold after President Obama rejected TransCanada’s initial construction proposal – are some key findings that run counter to the rosy picture of abundant supply and lower prices so often painted by US politicians. Canadian companies backing the Keystone XL – touted as enhancing US energy security with a big new surge of imported Canadian oil – actually expect it to supply more lucrative Gulf Coast export markets as well as raise Midwest oil prices by reducing “oversupply” in that region. These little-publicized findings are contained in the studies and testimony of experts working for TransCanada, the company that wants to build the pipeline from Alberta’s tar sands across America’s heartland to Gulf Coast refineries. Some of these concerns popped up, albeit briefly, in US congressional testimony last year on the pipeline project, and have given rise to a recent proposal to bar the sale of Keystone oil overseas. In the latest round of Capitol Hill fighting over the pipeline, Senate Democrats on Thursday defeated a Republican amendment to the transportation bill that would have fast-tracked the project by stripping the State Department of its approval authority and giving it to Congress. In February, legislation to force US approval of the pipeline passed the House 237-187. That bill would strip the president of authority to block the project and give the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 30 days to approve the pipeline. But most of the heated partisan rhetoric over job creation and gasoline prices glosses over what Keystone would or wouldn’t do for the US.

### Politics 2NC

#### Keystone is a partisan issue that will spark massive fights. That’s the 1NC Clayton evidence. Both sides have vested interests in escalating the Keystone debate

#### The plan will be a fight in the Senate

**The Hill**, 3/8/**2012** (Senate rejects Keystone in 56-42 vote, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/215051-senate-blocks-keystone-pipeline-approval-plan)

The Senate has rejected a GOP plan to approve construction of the Keystone XL oil pipeline after President Obama made personal calls to Democrats urging them to oppose it. The 56-42 vote staves off an election-year rebuke of Obama, but will give political ammunition to backers of TransCanada Corp.’s plan to build a pipeline connecting Alberta’s massive tar sands projects to Gulf Coast refineries. Despite Obama's efforts, 11 Democrats brushed off Obama on the vote and sided with Republicans.

#### Keystone is politically toxic --- major backlash

**Barber**, 1/18/**2012** (Nigel – biopsychologist and blogger, Keystone Pipeline: Gift Horse or Threat to America, Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nigel-barber/keystone-pipeline_b_1214122.html>)

The Keystone pipeline pits jobs for Americans versus environmentalism and is politically toxic to the Obama administration, which is why Obama wanted to kick the can down the road whereas Republicans want to force an early Presidential decision on the project that can be used as a stick to beat him with during the election. Now Obama seems poised to reject the pipeline based on objection to the route, leaving the door open to a new application.

#### Flip-flop –

#### A) Obama has staked political capital on blocking Keystone.

**Washington Post**, 3/8/**2012** (Senate rejects expediting Keystone pipeline, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/senate-rejects-expediting-keystone-pipeline/2012/03/08/gIQAjDilzR\_story.html)

In the wake of lobbying by President Obama and Senate Democratic leaders, the Senate Thursday defeated legislation to speed up construction of a U-S.-Canadian oil pipeline. The White House victory came after the president started personally calling Democratic senators Wednesday night. The vote underscored the extent to which rising gas prices and energy supply have become a central political issue. Republicans--along with the oil industry, which is running a nationwide advertising campaign about energy supplies -- have been attacking Obama on the campaign trail for failing to fully exploit traditional oil and gas resources while Americans are financially stretched. Democrats and their environmental supporters counter that the president must weigh the benefits of fossil fuels against their environmental impact and the importance of promoting renewable energy.

#### B) Flip-flops destroy political capital

**Cohen 1997** (Jeffrey – professor of political science at Fordham University, Presidential Responsiveness and Public Policy Making, p. 123)

A president cannot, without good reason, **alter his policy stance**. And even if he has good reason to change his policy position on an issue, he may have to **bear some costs** from doing so. The public and other political elites may view him as waffling, indecisive, weak, uncommitted, and/or duplicitous. This seems very much to be one of the major charges against Bill Clinton’s presidency. After abandoning his campaign promise of a middle-class tax cut because of budget deficit pressures, Clinton reoffered a tax cut in the wake of the devastating 1994 midterm elections, in which his party lost control of Congress. From being publicly cool toward the North American Free Trade pact during his presidential election campaign, he became an ardent promoter of that policy once in the Oval Office. From these, and many other occasions, Clinton has developed an image of a waffling politician, one who is forever changing his mind, perennially trying to stake out the most popular position with the public and not necessarily a **president who is able to lead**.

### Ext – Flip-Flops

#### Flip-flops are politically disastrous

Michael A. **Fitts**, professor of law at University of Pennsylvania Law School, January **1996**, University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 144 U. Pa. L. Rev. 827

Centralized and visible power, however, becomes a double-edged sword, once one explores the different ways in which unitariness and visibility can undermine an institution's informal influence, especially its ability to mediate conflict and appear competent. In this context, the visibility and centralization of the presidency can have mixed effects. As a single visible actor in an increasingly complex world, the unitary president can be prone to an overassessment of responsibility and error. He also may be exposed to a normative standard of personal assessment that may conflict with his institutional duties. At the same time, the modern president often does not have at his disposal those bureaucratic institutions that can help mediate or deflect many conflicts. Unlike members of Congress or the agencies, he often must be clear about the tradeoffs he makes. Furthermore, a president who will be held personally accountable for government policy cannot pursue or hold inconsistent positions and values over a long period of time without suffering political repercussions. In short, the centralization and individualization of the presidency can be a source of its power, as its chief proponents and critics accurately have suggested, as well as its political illegitimacy and ultimate weakness.

### AT: Popularity Key to Agenda

#### Public popularity irrelevant

**Gelman 9** (Andrew, Professor of Statistics and Political Science and Director of the Applied Statistics Center – Columbia University, FiveThirtyEight.com, 11-14, http://www.fivethirtyeight.com/2009/11/politicians-have-lot-of-leeway-in-how.html)

Matthew Yglesias remarks that, when staking out positions, congressmembers are not very strongly constrained by the ideologies of their constituents. Wow, that was a lot of big words. What I meant to say was**:** Congressmembers and Senators can pretty much vote how they want on most issues, whatever their constituents happen to believe. Not always, of course, but a representative can take a much more liberal or conservative line than the voters in his or her district or state, and still do fine when election time comes. Yglesias gives some examples from the U.S. Senate, and I just wanted to back him up by citing some research from the House of Representatives. First, here's a graph (from chapter 9 of Red State, Blue State; the numbers are based on research with Jonathan Katz) showing that, when running for reelection, it helps for a congressmember to be a moderate--but not by much: Being a moderate is worth about 2% of the vote in a congressional election: it ain't nuthin, but it certainly is not a paramount concern for most representatives. To look at this another way, here's a graph showing the members of the House of Representatives in 1993-1994: Representatives from more politically extreme districts tended themselves to be further to the right (if Republicans) or to the left (if Democrats), but only slightly so, with a lot of exceptions. There's a lot of leeway on where politicians stand. (And, yes, many of these Democrats did lose in 1994--but, pretty much, the ones that lost were those in marginal districts, not particularly those with extremely liberal ideologies. By this I'm not trying to say the extreme liberals benefited from their ideology--as noted above, I estimate that it hurt them by, on average, a couple percentage points of the vote--but that these couple percentage points didn't really matter much; the partisanship of their districts was much more of the key factor in determining whether they were reelected.) More discussion here, in the context of the notorious "median voter theorem." As I wrote earlier, I am sympathetic to the related point that it can be a mistake to assume that politicians of your political party agree with you, deep down, on the issues, and that they're only voting differently because of expedience, craven political calculation, or whatever. It's worth considering the hypothesis that lots of Democratic politicians do not share the values and policy preferences of lots of Democratic voters, and similarly for the Republicans. Given the diversity of public opinion, this really has to be true on some issues, and it very well might be true all over the place. Another way of saying all this is: Incumbent congressmembers almost always win reelection. And, when they don't, they're often losing as part of a national swing (as in the 1994 Republican sweep or the 2006/2008 Democratic shift). And when an incumbent does lose unexpectedly, it can be for something unrelated to their votes (remember the "check kiting scandal" of 1992?).

#### Prefer our evidence: best studies and theory

**Bond and Fleisher 96** (Jon R. and Richard, Professors of Political Science – Texas A&M University, The President in Legislation, p. 29)

Thus studies of congressional behavior and Neustadt's theory lead one to expect that presidential popularity will have **only a marginal impact** on voting decisions of representatives in Congress. Liberal Democrats, for example, did not become solid supporters of President Reagan even at the zenith of his popularity. The expectation of marginal effects is not to deny that for some individuals on some votes, the president's popularity with the public is a crucial-perhaps even deciding-consideration. But the available evidence does suggest that, in general, presidential popularity is **not likely to alter** greatly the **decisions of** individuals already in **Congress**. Instead, its effects are likely to be indirect, operating through the electoral process to alter the distribution of partisan and ideological forces in Congress through changes in membership.

## Economy Answers

### Jobs 1NC

#### Keystone has a minimal effect on jobs

**CUGLI** September **2011** (Cornell University Global Labor Institute- Part of Cornell’s Institute for Industrial and Labor Relations) “Pipe Dreams?” http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/upload/GLI\_KeystoneXL\_Reportpdf.pdf

A calculation of the direct jobs that might be created by KXL can begin with an examination of the jobs on-site to build and inspect the pipeline. The project will create no more than 2,500-4,650 temporary direct construction jobs for two years, according to TransCanada’s own data supplied to the State Department. 9 The State Department’s FEIS considers each component of construction labor, and provides jobs data for the construction spreads, pump stations, and tank farms: » Construction of the pipeline is planned to occur in 17 construction spreads or completed lengths (Table 3.10.1-13). Ten spreads are planned along the proposed Steele City Segment, six spreads along the proposed Gulf Coast Segment, and one spread along the proposed Houston Lateral. Final spread configurations and construction schedules could result in shorter spreads. » Approximately 500 to 600 construction and inspection personnel would work on each spread, except for the proposed Houston Lateral which would require approximately 250 workers. Each spread would require 6 to 9 months to complete. Construction of new pump stations would require 20 to 30 additional workers at each site. Construction of all pump stations would be completed in 18 to 24 months. Tank farm construction would require approximately 30 to 40 construction personnel over a period of 15 to 18 months. 10 Based on jobs information provided by TransCanada for the FEIS, KXL US on-site construction and inspection creates only 5,060-9,250 person-years of employment (1 person-year = 1 person working full time for 1 year). This is equivalent to 2,500-4,650 jobs per year over two years. On-site construction labor thus accounts for only a small share (about 5-10%) of overall KXL US project costs. 11 Stated another way, KXL US on-site employment is only about 1-2 person-years per $1 million project cost. 12

### Ext – Keystone Won’t Make a Lot of Jobs

#### No economic benefit from Keystone XL

Weiss, 2/22/2012 (Daniel, Senior Fellow and the Director of Climate Strategy at American Progress, Politicians say they want to support the “Keystone Economy.” Here’s why that vision means fewer jobs, no impact on gas prices, and more pollution, p, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/02/22/429981/keystone-vision-economic-mirage/)

Same oil prices for the United States. The analysis determined that the pipeline will only have a tiny impact on the price of crude and other products: “Under the KXL scenario, delivered prices for [oil sands]…into PADD3 Gulf Coast are lower than under the No KXL case and those for PADD2 [Midwest], higher. The effect is limited, no more than around $0.70/bbl.” This means that gasoline prices in the Gulf Coast region would at best be only one and three quarter cents lower per gallon. Meanwhile gasoline prices would increase in the Midwest if Keystone is built because the oil glut there now is keeping prices lower. Time magazine concurred that Keystone would have almost no impact on gasoline prices: “Keystone would have little immediate [price] effect, especially since there’s already sufficient pipeline infrastructure in place for the next few years.” • Relatively few jobs created. The State Department’s “Executive Summary of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Keystone XL Project” predicts that the construction workforce would only “consist of approximately 5,000 t0 6,000 workers.” These are far fewer jobs than the claims of the big oil companies promoting Keystone. In contrast, the Recovery Act investments in clean energy technologies created 733,000 direct jobs through 2010 according to the Economic Policy Institute and the Blue Green Alliance.

#### Keystone XL only benefits oil companies

Droitsch 1/11/2012 (Danielle-Director at the Natural Resources Defense Council, Don't be fooled - the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is not a jobs plan, but an oil export plan, Natural Resources Defense Council p. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ddroitsch/dont\_be\_fooled\_-\_the\_keystone.html)

You’ll hear the GOP, the American Petroleum Institute, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce make wild claims about the job creation potential of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. Don’t be fooled. The pipeline company itself admits only “a few hundred permanent jobs” are created by Keystone XL. The debate over whether Keystone XL creates jobs is a convenient diversion from something oil company backers don’t want you to know: this is an export pipeline to help them access foreign markets and bypass the United States. Oil companies will make bigger profits and oil prices for Americans will increase. That’s not a project that helps Americans. It’s a project that helps Big Oil.

### Ext – Keystone Job Creation is Overstated

#### Number of jobs created by Keystone XL is greatly overstated

DeCock 3-7-12 (John- former president of Clean Water Action, 9 year term as Executive Director of the Sierra Club) http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-decock/keystone-xl-vs-high-speed\_b\_1327461.html

The jobs which will be created by the pipeline are few in number and temporary. TransCanada, the company behind the pipeline, claims 20,000 jobs will be created. Although that is a fairly humble number of jobs for which to sacrifice the future of the planet, it is greatly overstated. The Chamber of Commerce advances the fanciful notion that the pipeline will create "250,000" permanent jobs. Yee haw! However the United States State Department sees things differently. They project 5,000-6,000 jobs U.S. jobs. But wait there's more! An analysis by the Cornell University Global Labor Institute sites even lower projections. They project only 500 to 1400 temporary construction jobs. Their projections are burdened by rigorous research and analysis so they cannot be as optimistic as TransCanada who would make billions of dollars in revenue. That's not to say that jobs won't be created. They just won't be created in the U.S. This leads us to the second point. The oil extracted at great cost to all of us will not be for the United States market. Most of this oil is being exported, along with the jobs they will create. The pipeline ends at a sea port city for a reason. The Keystone XL pipeline won't do a damn thing about gas prices, but there are those who find comfort in fantasy.

#### Keystone XL Jobs number is overstated

Henry 1-18-12 (Terrence- bachelor’s degree in International Studies, former editor for The Atlantic)

http://stateimpact.npr.org/texas/2012/01/18/why-obama-decided-against-the-keystone-xl-pipeline/

Many estimates of the potential jobs created by the pipeline are way off. “Regarding employment,” the report says, “the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline would likely create several thousand temporary jobs associated with construction; however, the project would not have a significant impact on long-term employment in the United States.” It goes on to note that while some have projected hundreds of thousands of jobs as a result of the pipeline, “this inflated number appears to be a misinterpretation of one of the economic analyses prepared on the pipeline.”

In fact, the pipeline would only result in a few thousand jobs. “Based on the amount of money the applicant projects it would spend on labor in building the pipeline, and the number of construction crews likely to be used in constructing the pipeline, the final EIS [Environmental Impact Study] estimated there would be approximately 5,000 to 6,000 direct construction jobs in the United States that would last for the two years that it would take to build the pipeline,” the report says. And the overall economic impact would be minimal. Relying on the Environmental Impact Study prepared by the State Department for the pipeline in late August, the administration says that “over the remainder of this decade, even if no new cross-border pipelines were constructed, there is likely to be little difference in the amount of crude oil refined at U.S. refineries, the amount of crude oil and refined products such as gasoline imported to (or exported from) the United States, the cost of crude oil or refined products in the United States, or the amount of crude oil imported from Canada.”

### AT: Perryman Group

#### The Perryman Group number is a miscalculation --- Keystone barely creates jobs and raises gas prices

**Alter**, 3/1/**2012** (Jonathan – Bloomberg View columnist, Keystone Pipeline brings Pain at Pump, Bloomberg, p. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-03-02/keystone-pipe-brings-pain-at-pump-few-jobs-commentary-by-jonathan-alter.html>)

The project would increase domestic oil prices by more than $6 a barrel and prices at the pump in parts of the country by about 20 cents a gallon. You read that right. At a time when rising gas prices threaten President Barack Obama’s re-election, the Republicans’ most ballyhooed remedy -- a new pipeline -- would make the problem worse. Before I explain why, here’s a little background on Keystone’s other practical shortcomings beyond its broader threat to a clean energy future. The same Republicans who opposed the auto bailouts that saved about 1.5 million jobs (according to the Center for Automotive Research) claim that Obama’s delay of a decision on Keystone until after the election is a travesty because it’s a “job-killer.” The president’s announcement in January that he would punt was highly political; he didn’t want to offend environmentalists in the Democratic base. But it’s a myth to say unemployment will rise as a result. TransCanada Corp., the company building the pipeline, initially estimated that the project would create “a few hundred” permanent jobs. The State Department put the number at 20. Experts I consulted say that maintenance of the specialty pipe used in Keystone is more complicated than the State Department figures indicate. Presumably the refineries processing the additional oil might add some jobs. So the total number of permanent jobs could perhaps be closer to 1,000. Knowing that such paltry figures would harm their efforts to sell the project to the U.S. public, TransCanada underwrote a study by an outfit called the Perryman Group claiming that Keystone XL will create 119,000 total jobs. But according to a report by the Cornell Global Labor Institute, the Perryman study is bogus. It included the vaguely calculated multiplier effects of $1 billion spent for a section of the pipeline in Kansas and Oklahoma that has already been built and isn’t part of the controversial extension.

#### **Indict of the Perryman Study**

CUGLI September 2011 (Cornell University Global Labor Institute- Part of Cornell’s Institute for Industrial and Labor Relations) “Pipe Dreams?” http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/upload/GLI\_KeystoneXL\_Reportpdf.pdf

In conclusion, the industry’s claim that KXL will create 119,000 total jobs (direct, indirect, and induced) jobs is based on a flawed and poorly documented study, which fails to apply its own standards for conducting a quality job study. Most notably, Perryman wrongly includes over $1 billion in spending and over 10,000 person-years of employment for a section of the Keystone project in Kansas and Oklahoma that is not part of KXL and has already been built.

### AT: TransCanada Stats

#### **KXL Makes Very Few Jobs**

Kohn, 1/18/2012 (Sally, political Commentator, Six reasons Keystone XL was a bad deal all along, p. www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along/)

In 2008, TransCanada’s original permit application to the State Department said the Keystone XL pipeline would create “a peak workforce of approximately 3,500 to 4,200 construction personnel” in temporary jobs building the pipeline. By 2011, now facing growing opposition to the pipeline, TransCanada had inflated these numbers (using undisclosed formulas) to 20,000. Supporters of the proposal, backed by big oil, have since trumpeted these trumped up numbers.

### Jobs 1NC – AT: Manufacturing Jobs

#### KXL has a small effect on Manufacturing

**CUGLI** September **2011** (Cornell University Global Labor Institute- Part of Cornell’s Institute for Industrial and Labor Relations) “Pipe Dreams?” http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/upload/GLI\_KeystoneXL\_Reportpdf.pdf

In making a case for the thousands of manufacturing jobs offered by KXL, TransCanada provides the assurances that “approximately 75% of the pipe for the US portion of the proposed Project would be purchased from North American pipe manufacturing facilities and that regardless of the country of origin, it would purchase pipe only from qualified pipe suppliers and trading houses.” 22 However, there is strong evidence to suggest that almost half of the primary material input for KXL—steel pipe—will not even be produced in the United States. All in all, the claims made by KXL proponents that the project will generate thousands of manufacturing jobs are unsubstantiated and misleading. If a significant proportion of the pipe is fabricated outside the US, this further decreases positive US employment impacts. Even the steel pipe fabricated within the US is made from imported steel, which further decreases positive US employment impacts. Furthermore, the evidence also suggests that only final processing work is likely to be done in the US, and that other pipe components are also being imported. This further reduces any potential US manufacturing jobs impacts.

## Oil Dependency Answers

### Oil Dependence 1NC

#### Status Quo Solves- Current Pipelines can transport oil to the U.S.

**Swift 2012** (Anthony- Energy Analyst at the National Resource Defense Council, BA in political science and biology) “Keystone XL: A Tar Sands Pipeline to Increase Oil Prices” http://www.nrdc.org/energy/keystone-pipeline/files/Keystone-Oil-Prices-Report.pdf

Keystone XL is not a pipeline to the United States, but one through it. Existing pipelines from Canada to the United States provide enough capacity to move all the oil that Canada produces. In fact, Canada’s current oil production uses only approximately half of its export pipeline capacity. In 2010, Canada exported less than 2 million bpd of crude oil. The vast majority of these exports were produced in western Canada and transported to the United States. Canada already has an excess of crude oil export pipelines—enough to export nearly 4.1 million bpd (see table 2: Total Capacity of Canada’s Existing Export Pipelines). Tar sands oil production in Canada is at approximately 1.6 million bpd. Tar sands production would have to reach nearly 4.1 million bpd for Keystone XL to begin to transport additional crude into the United States. Even if Canadian tar sands oil production increases at the highly aggressive pace that its oil industry predicts—reaching 3.7 million bpd by 2025—it would take more than 15 years to fill the existing pipelines to the United States.

#### **Even if Keystone XL happened, the oil would not remain in the U.S.**

Turner, 2-24-12 (Ted- Founder and Chairman of the United Nations Foundation, founder of the Nuclear Test Initiative) “Stop Keystone Pipeline before it’s too late” <http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/22/opinion/turner-keystone-pipeline/index.html>

Meanwhile, the pro-pipeline lobby is pushing the public to accept Keystone XL with fuzzy promises about jobs and security. But TransCanada's jobs claims have been widely discredited, and there is no guarantee the oil transported by the pipeline would remain in the United States for sale. An attempt in Congress to require the oil to be consumed in the United States was rejected just last week, and it has been widely detailed that Gulf Coast refineries plan to export the finished product to Europe and Latin America. How do we become more energy secure under that scenario?

#### **KXL Doesn’t Reduce Oil Dependency**

Kohn, 1/18/2012 (Sally, political Commentator, Six reasons Keystone XL was a bad deal all along, p. www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along/)

The oil to be sent through Keystone XL pipeline was never destined for US markets. In its own presentation to investors about the proposed pipeline extension, TransCanada (the company behind Keystone XL) boasted that most if not all of the extracted and refined oil would be exported --- sold in overseas markets where oil fetches a higher price (and thus turns a higher profit for the company).

### Ext – Tar Sand Will Be Exported

#### The oil from tar sand will be exported, not used in America

Kretzmann 8/31/2011 (Steve- Executive Editor Director at Oil Change International, Report: Exporting Energy Security: Keystone XL Exposed, Oil Change International p. http://priceofoil.org/2011/08/31/report-exporting-energy-security-keystone-xl-exposed/)

In pushing for the Obama Administration’s approval of TransCanada’s proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline, the North American oil industry and its political patrons argue that the pipeline is necessary for American energy security and its construction will help wean America of dependence on Mideast oil. But a closer look at the new realities of the global oil market and at the companies who will profit from the pipeline reveals a completely different story: Keystone XL will not lessen U.S. dependence on foreign oil, but rather transport Canadian oil to American refineries for export to overseas markets. A new report from Oil Change International lays out the case, based on data and documents from the U.S. Energy Information Administration and the Canadian National Energy Board, corporate disclosures to regulators and investors, and analysis of the rapidly shifting oil market. Keystone XL is an export pipeline. The Port Arthur, Texas, refiners at the end of its route are focused on expanding exports to Europe, and Latin America. Much of the fuel refined from the pipeline’s heavy crude oil will never reach U.S. drivers’ tanks. Valero, the key customer for crude oil from Keystone XL, has explicitly detailed an export strategy to its investors. Because Valero’s Port Arthur refinery is in a Foreign Trade Zone, the company can carry out its strategy tax-free. In a shrinking U.S. market, Keystone XL is not needed. Since the project was announced, the oil industry acknowledges that higher fuel economy standards and slow economic growth mean declining U.S. oil demand, even as domestic production is booming. Oil from Keystone XL will therefore displace American crude from new, “unconventional” domestic fields in Texas or North Dakota. “To issue a presidential permit for the Keystone XL, the Administration must find that the pipeline serves the national interest,” said Stephen Kretzmann, executive director of Oil Change International. “An honest assessment shows that rather than serving U.S. interests, Keystone XL serves only the interests of tar sands producers and shippers, and a few Gulf Coast refiners aiming to export the oil.” Valero has contracted to take at least 100,000 barrels of tar sands crude a day from Keystone XL until 2030. It’s publicly disclosed business model relies on refining heavy sour crude for export. It is upgrading its Port Arthur refinery to process heavy sour into diesel fuel. Its investor presentations clearly show it plans to ship diesel to Latin America and Europe. Valero – the Texas independent behind last year’s attempt to overturn California’s clean fuel standards – is the only U.S. company among the six customers who have jointly committed to purchase 76 percent of Keystone XL’s initial capacity. The other refiners are Shell, which is part of Motiva, a joint venture between Royal Dutch Shell and the Saudi government, and Total of France, both of which have newly upgraded facilities in Port Arthur tax-free trade zones. There are also two Canadian producers and one international oil-trading firm in the group of six customers. “Oil is a fundamentally global market – the idea that the pipeline enhances our energy security is a scam.” said Kretzmann. “Let’s hope the Obama Administration doesn’t fall for it. In fact, the only way to truly reduce our dependence on foreign oil is to reduce our dependence on all oil. Let’s not fool ourselves that we will achieve ‘energy independence’ by serving as a middleman for access to overseas markets.”

### Oil Prices Advantage Answers

#### Keystone XL will have no impact on prices --- global market distribution checks

**Washington Post**, 3/2/**2012** (Will the Keystone XL pipeline lower gasoline prices?, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/fact-checker/post/will-the-keystone-xl-pipeline-lower-gasoline-prices/2012/03/01/gIQAtWkXlR\_blog.html)

But we are interested in his assertion that Keystone “will…help bring down prices at the pump.” Is this correct? The Facts First of all, even if the Keystone XL pipeline were suddenly approved, it would not be completed until at least 2014, so building it would have no impact on gasoline prices this summer, predicted to be near record highs. We could not find any experts, even those referred to us by Upton’s staff, to say that the **prospect of the pipeline being built in the future would somehow impact the price of gasoline today**. Still, Upton did not specifically claim that this supposed decline at the pump would happen anytime soon, though a tweet from House Speaker John Boehner on Feb. 17 claimed “House GOP acts to address rising gas prices” after the bill containing the Keystone XL provision was approved. Second, the price of gasoline depends on a complex array of factors, though the largest one is the price of crude oil. (See this handy tutorial by the Energy Information Administration.) The Keystone XL pipeline, which would carry 1.1 million barrels per day, is specifically designed to deal with the fact that increased production of crude oil in Canada and the Great Plains has left a glut in that area — overwhelming refinery demand — and it is difficult to get the oil to the Gulf Coast, the center of U.S. refining. This has depressed the price of crude oil in the Midwest, though the Midwest refiners have not passed on the savings to consumers. (The price of gasoline in that area essentially is dependent on the global price because otherwise refiners would not ship the gasoline there.) A historical note: West Texas Intermediate crude oil is priced at Cushing, Oklahoma, and historically traded at a premium to other crude oils. Cushing pipelines flow to the Midwest, not to the Gulf Coast, but the price of WTI crude has recently traded at a discount because of the oversupply in the Midwest. (Here’s a map that shows the route.) There is a lively debate among oil-industry analysts about whether Keystone will impact gasoline prices in the Midwest. Philip K. Verleger, a noted oil economist, has argued that the pipeline would increase gasoline prices in the upper Midwest. He said yesterday that he stands by that estimate, figuring it would amount to between five and ten cents per gallon. “Overall, the pipeline will have no impact on prices consumers pay. None. The reason is that the products produced from the crude will be sold into the world market -- exported -- if prices fall below world levels,” he said in an email. “This means that consumers outside the Midwest will get no benefit from the line while consumers in the upper Midwest may pay more.”

## China Answers

### China 1NC

#### Canada has already begun to sell their oil to China

Wheeler 6/14/2012 (Carolynne- Beijing-based journalist, China's appetite for energy puts pressure on Canada;

Besides the oil sands' resources, a stable Western partner could be a training ground as China works to become a global player, The Globe and Mail p. LexisNexis)

With China pouring $16-billion into Canada's oil and gas industry in the last two years alone, the pressure is on for Canada to develop the pipelines that will move oil and liquefied natural gas to the West Coast for shipping to Asia. Prime Minister Stephen Harper has pledged to streamline the environmental review process required for projects like the contentious Northern Gateway championed by Enbridge Inc., and recently upped the review threshold for foreign investment to $1-billion from $330-million to better accommodate growing Chinese investment. But China's unquenchable thirst for energy is not the whole story. The world's second-largest economy is also trying to learn how to be a world player in the oil market, on the level of a BHP Billiton Ltd., or Exxon Mobil Corp. Canada has provided a useful training ground in those efforts. "If Canada can supply some additional oil through the pipeline, or LNG, to Asia, this could be an additional source to the Chinese market. But it is not the mainstay, not the priority for Chinese investors and stakeholders," said Xu Xiaojie, head of the international energy program with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, a policy adviser to the government. "Investment in Canada may be aimed at some benefit, or technical know-how, at gaining a better understanding of working with Western counterparts and companies," said Mr. Xu, author of a new book about China's energy ambitions, Energy Black Swan. "We now realize investment in Canada may act as a bridge for China and the developed world." As a stable country with both rule of law and proven oil reserves, Canada provides a safe alternative to countries like Libya and Sudan, where political turmoil served as a rude awakening to Chinese state-owned oil majors trying to play in the big leagues. Not only did China lose billions in Libya during that country's civil war, it is facing the repercussions of currying favour with the wrong dictator now that Moammar Gadhafi is dead. But Canada is not the only stable democracy with rich energy assets. "China is not desperate for our oil," said Wenran Jiang, a senior fellow at the Asia-Pacific Foundation and special adviser on China to the U.S.- and Canada-based Energy Council. China has shown "serious concerns about whether they will have access to it in the future because they have put so much money into it," he said. "China can learn from us. They can also learn from the U.S., where they are now investing ... Canada is not the only player when it comes to learning Western technology, management and know-how," Mr. Jiang said. Small quantities of Canadian oil are already going to China. In February, Cenovus Energy Inc. announced it had delivered 250,000 barrels, or half a shipload, of oil to a Chinese customer - an announcement likely designed to help ease China's worries about whether Canadian oil would ever land in China's refineries. The company hasn't revealed further numbers, but has confirmed that it is continuing to use its 11,500 barrels per day of service capacity on Kinder Morgan Inc.'s Trans Mountain pipeline to the Westridge Marine Terminal in Vancouver to sell oil at the dock to markets that include Asia. "We are definitely looking to maximize the amount of oil that we transport to the west coast," said Cenovus media relations adviser Jessica Wilkinson.

#### Canada will sell their oil regardless

Maxwell 6/8/2012 (John W- Professor at Indiana University, Canada will pursue trade with China regardless of U.S. energy policies, Billings Gazette p. http://m.billingsgazette.com/news/opinion/guest/guest-opinion-canada-will-pursue-trade-with-china-regardless-of/article\_5e34c374-1bfe-572a-80c3-4b8566839cbf.html)

Following the November elections, I believe that construction of the pipeline will go forward regardless of the outcome of the presidential election. The decision to delay the pipeline was based on a political calculation not to alienate Democratic supporters who identify themselves as environmentalists. However, building the pipeline will provide economic benefits at little or no environmental costs since Canadians will sell their oil regardless and so the eventual decision to proceed with the pipeline is almost inevitable. So why am I arguing against the notion that U.S. energy policy is forcing Canada to pursue a long-range trading pact with China? Simply because one should not make the mistake of equating short-term public discussion with long-term public policy. The Canadian government likely knows that the pipeline will be built and a delay of a few months is unlikely to affect long-term Canadian policy. It is a mistake, however, to believe that long-term Canadian trade and energy policies are driven by current U.S. energy policies. Simply put, the Chinese economy is far too important for Canada to ignore. In the past Canada found itself in the fortunate position of being the neighbor of the world’s unrivaled economic powerhouse, but that is not the reality we live in today. While the U.S. economy is still the world’s largest, China is gaining fast and Canadians would be foolish to ignore this fact. Canadians know full well that crude oil is a commodity that commands a world price no matter where it is sold. If that were the end of the story, then selling to America would be best because transportation and other transactions costs would be lower. That isn’t the end of the story, however. Under the North American Free Trade Agreement, the sale of Canadian crude oil to the United States cannot be restricted. The sale of crude oil, however, is less profitable than the sale of refined oil. Many Canadians feel their government negotiated a bad deal under NAFTA because they would like to sell refined, not crude, oil to the U.S. If Canada builds a pipeline over the Rocky Mountains to its west coast, it could refine the crude and sell the product to China at a greater profit than selling crude to the United States. At the same time, if Canada establishes itself as a reliable supplier of oil to China and other parts of Asia, it would raise its importance as a trading partner with these nations, which will only become more important in the future. We all know about the value of portfolio diversification, and with Asia surging while America struggles it is readily apparent to Canadians that diversification in trade is beneficial for them. Like any sovereign nation, Canada will pursue policies that are in its own best interest, and with a rising Asia, it is naive to assume that American energy policy is dictating Canada’s choices. A pipeline over the Rocky Mountains to Canada’s west coast may not be built, but if it isn’t, it will be due to opposition from Canada’s “greens” and skepticism about doing business with Chinese state-owned oil companies, not U.S. energy policies. It is interesting to note that environmentalists make the same naïve assumption about U.S. energy policy dictating Canadian actions. They want to stop Keystone XL because they think by doing so they will slow or stop oil sands — which they label tar sands — development. This is untrue; Canadians will develop their oils sands regardless. Ironically the U.S., if it chooses not to develop Keystone, will lose a bit of leverage regarding how these reserves are developed.

#### Double hulls prevent oil spill damage from tankers

**Houston Chronicle** March 11, **2009** (“Tanker’s double hull prevented major spill off Galveston”p. http://www.chron.com/news/houston-texas/article/Tanker-s-double-hull-prevented-major-spill-off-1731407.php)

Galveston Coast Guard Commander James Elliott on Wednesday credited the SKS Satilla’s sturdy double-hulled construction with preventing a major oil spill after the Norwegian tanker crashed into submerged debris late last week. An underwater examination of the ship, which was carrying 41 million gallons of crude oil, revealed a gaping hole in the port side of the vessel’s outer hull.

The ship was awaiting permission Wednesday to sail to Portugal, where it will be placed in dry dock for repair. The Satilla was en route to an offshore lightering facility near Galveston when it struck the Ensco 74, a jackup oil rig swept from its moorings off the Louisiana coast by Hurricane Ike.

### China – Emissions Up Now

#### China will increase its CO2 emissions

**New York Times,** June 14**, 2008 (** Asia/Pacific News/p. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/14/world/asia/14china.html)

China has clearly overtaken the United States as the world’s leading emitter of carbon dioxide, the main heat-trapping gas produced by human activity, a new study has found, its emissions increasing 8 percent in 2007. The Chinese increase accounted for two-thirds of the growth in the year’s global greenhouse gas emissions, the study found. The report, released Friday by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, found that in 2007 China’s emissions were 14 percent higher than those of the United States. In the previous year’s annual study, the researchers found for the first time **that China had become the world’s leading emitter, with carbon emissions 7 percent higher by volume than the United States in 2006**. Many experts had been skeptical of the earlier study, whose results were less clear-cut than those released Friday. The International Energy Agency had continued to say only that **China was projected to overtake the United States by the end of 2007**. Now there is little doubt. “The difference had grown to a 14 percent difference, and that’s indeed quite large,” said Jos Olivier, a senior scientist at the Dutch agency. “It’s now so large that it’s quite a robust conclusion.”**China’s emissions are most likely to continue growing** substantially for years to come because they are tied to the country’s strong economic growth and its particular mix of industry and power sources, the researchers said.

China is heavily dependent on coal and has seen its most rapid growth in some of the world’s most heavily polluting industrial sectors: cement, aluminum and plate glass. Twenty percent of China’s emissions come from its cement kilns, essential for its construction boom and likely to be working overtime this year amid preparations for the Olympics and rebuilding after last month’s devastating earthquake. The Dutch agency’s findings were based on recently published information on cement production and on energy use from the oil company BP.

### Ext – Exportation Inevitable

#### **Canada Will Export Oil to China**

Simon, 6/17/2012 (Scott, Chair of Taiwan studies at The University of Ottowa, Parliament Needs to Look at Chinese Oil Sands Investment, p. http://www.theepochtimes.com/n2/opinion/parliament-needs-to-look-at-chinese-oil-sands-investment-251399.html)

Prime Minister Harper’s February trip to China was portrayed as an attempt to promote Canadian oil sales, especially after the failure of TransCanada’s Keystone XL pipeline project that sought to gain rapid environmental approval in the United States. After Nebraska farmers and environmentalists voiced concern about risks to the Ogallala Aquifer, a democratic government delayed approval until environmental assessments could be completed. For Canada, Enbridge’s proposed Northern Gateway Pipeline, which would ship crude oil to Kitimat, British Columbia, for shipment to China, was suddenly endorsed as a new alternative. Advertisement Certainly, Harper’s challenge is not to sell oil. The Chinese, like the Americans, need a steady supply of oil to fuel their economic growth. They do not need to be convinced so by visiting politicians, as if Harper were peddling snake oil rather than petroleum. China’s recent entry into the oil sands, although unprecedented in Canadian history, is done according to Canadian law. And Harper’s legislative agenda may give China’s state-run oil companies an even stronger presence in Canada. Harper thus needs to sell his radical plans for Canada’s oil sands to Canadians. The auction of Canadian oil assets to China began under Harper’s watch. In the eight largest energy deals of 2010 and 2011, China invested $16 billion in the industry. The most significant deal happened when Chinese state-owned Sinopec purchased outright Daylight Energy for $2.2 billion in December 2011. Sinopec also contributed in 2011 to a consortium that provided over $100 million of upfront financing to Enbridge for the Northern Gateway Pipeline. And Sinopec owns a 9.3 percent stake in Syncrude. With all of these investments, China has already become a major player in the oil fields, in ways consistent with Canadian law. Harper’s challenge is not to sell oil. The Chinese, like the Americans, need a steady supply of oil to fuel their economic growth. This is why the focus of attention should be Parliament. In Beijing, Harper announced the conclusion of negotiations for a Canada-China Foreign Investment Promotion and Protection Agreement (FIPA), which will surely accelerate Chinese state investment in the sector, but which requires parliamentary oversight.

### China – China Exports Have a Long TF

#### China Pipeline is a ways off

**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 Harper certainly wants to keep his options open, the alternative pipeline under consideration wouldn't necessarily be available to Canada any sooner than a new U.S. route, assuming it eventually gets a gets a green light in 2013. Canadian officials say that assessment of the northern route won't be completed until late 2013. The State Department, which is overseeing consideration of alternative routes, is expected early in 2013.

### China – AT: Sea Lions Impact

#### Shutting down fishing in the SQ solves for sea lions

**Murphy**, [7/03/**10**,](http://articles.latimes.com/2010/aug/03) (Kim, Los Angeles Times, Fishing limits proposed to save sea lions in Alaska, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/aug/03/nation/la-na-sea-lions-20100803)

Federal authorities have proposed shutting down fishing for cod and mackerel across more than 131,000 square miles in the western Aleutian Islands of Alaska in an effort to halt continuing declines in Steller sea lions. The measure is part of a package of restrictions proposed Monday for a total of more than 350,000 square miles of the West Coast's most productive fishing grounds that could affect fisheries worth $30 million a year. A biological opinion released by the National Marine Fisheries Service suggests that clamping down on harvests of fish that are important parts of the sea lions' diet may be the only way to halt the decline of the animals, whose numbers have shrunk by 83% since the 1970s. Though they are holding steady in some places in Alaska, worrying declines have persisted in the western Aleutians. The number of adult sea lions in that region decreased 45% from 2000 to 2008, and pup production shrank at a similar rate, prompting federal scientists to try to move quickly. Fishing organizations have called for more time to study and comment on the proposal, which would take effect at the beginning of 2011. They argue that predation from killer whales, climate shifts and other factors are impairing the marine mammals' recovery in the North Pacific, and they point out that sea lion numbers across Alaska are fairly stable. But Doug Mecum, regional supervisor for the National Marine Fisheries Service, said the sea lions could not head toward recovery until the steep declines in the western Aleutians had been halted. "The numbers overall are kind of stable and they've even rebounded some. But 'stability' is not what the courts have found is adequate under the Endangered Species Act. They need to be recovering," Mecum said in an interview.

#### No evidence to prove that oil affects sea lion population

**Seal Conservation Society 2010**, (Seal Conservation Society- Expert Group on saving Sea Lions, Steller Sea Lion, http://pinnipeds.org/seal-information/species-information-pages/sea-lions-and-fur-seals/steller-sea-lion)

Steller sea lions in Alaska may have been affected by the 1997-98 El Nino although it is not known yet to what extent. Environmental changes in the Bering Sea ecosystem, such as warmer ocean temperatures, altered ocean currents and atmospheric conditions, may also be affecting the species. There is also a danger to Steller sea lions from vessels running aground in their habitat, although the species is not as vulnerable to oil-related injuries as sea otters or sea birds. In May 1999 a 24-metre fishing vessel ran aground on the rocks of Unimak Island in the Aleutian Islands, the coastguard saying that they expected the vessel to lose all 30,000 litres of diesel, lubricating and hydraulic oils which it was carrying. In the same month a 54-metre freighter carrying 420,000 litres of fuel oil ran aground at the entrance to Cold Bay, east of Unimak Island, leaking up to 400 litres of lubricating oil. A number of Steller sea lion haulout and rookery sites were affected by the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Prince William Sound, Alaska, in 1989 but inadequate data exists to determine the impact of the spill on the population. High levels of the antifouling paint tributyltin (TBT) have been found in Steller sea lions around Hokkaido.

### China – AT: US/China Relations

#### Relations resilient

China Daily 3 (2-13, Lexis)

During President Jiang Zemin's visit to the United States last year, he and Bush stated that China and the United States had extensive and crucial common interests and should expand their exchanges and co-operation in various areas to develop a constructive and co-operative Sino-US relationship. Improving Sino-US relations thus became the inevitable option in Washington's China policy. Since the mid-1980s, economic and trade exchanges have been a vital factor in bilateral ties and remain the most resilient chain. Bearing in mind the huge economic interests arising from China's entry to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Bush emphasized the importance of Sino-US economic and trade relations, even when pursuing a hard-line China policy in the initial period of his tenure. History has proved that, despite some twists and turns, common interests have overweighed differences in Sino-US relations.

#### No spillover

IPS 3 (Inter-Press Service, 11-4, Lexis)

Indeed, it now appears that, despite rising tensions over the bilateral trade balance and the value of the yuan, the realists centered in the State Department have decisively taken control over U.S. China policy, thanks largely to Beijing's own behavior and rapidly growing influence. "The administration has come to the conclusion that strategic engagement is the only viable option on relations with China," says Garrett. That Washington's major problem today is over currency, he adds, illustrates the degree to which Sino-U.S. relations have **stabilized**. "This is the kind of problem we have with Japan," Garrett said. "We're at the point where we can have differences in one area without it threatening **other aspects** of the relationship."

### Ext – US/China Relations Resilient

#### Common strategic interests ensure strong relations

Pollack 3 (Jonathan, chair of the Strategic Research Department at the Naval War College, where he directs the College’s Asia-Pacific Studies Group, “China and the United States Post-9/11” Orbis Autumn)

The usual account given for this shift is that after 9/11, the United States identified a new primary adversary, which was not China but international terrorism and the states aligned with it. The United States’ strategic imperative was to assemble the broadest possible coalition to combat terrorism and prevent the proliferation of WMD, and to avoid needless diversions or distractions from these paramount goals. America’s focus on open-ended commitments to defend the U.S. homeland and to counter radical Islam meant that American power and energies would be directed elsewhere. China’s strategic imperative was to give the United States as much latitude as possible without endangering Chinese vital interests, and to buy time for unfettered pursuit of the country’s modernization goals. China would therefore be able to pursue its national strategies unimpeded by major worries about the United States. An alternative argument emphasizes the effects of the new administration’s forceful assertion of American strategic priorities on Chinese leadership calculations. In this view, leaders in Beijing quickly understood that the United States was intent on defending U.S. interests by all available means and grasped the need to conform to these new power realities, lest Washington identify China as a potential adversary. Moreover, China’s increasing dependence on access to the U.S. market and on the unimpeded flow of U.S. corporate investment into China were judged far too important to the country’s internal stability and sustained development to be jeopardized. China therefore had neither the means nor the incentives to challenge U.S. global dominance, at least not directly. Both arguments, however, are incomplete. Larger changes are animating political and strategic calculations in both capitals, especially Beijing. Although these changes do not guarantee open-ended Sino-American amity and cooperation, they foreshadow a redefined relationship that subordinates or obscures the more contentious dimensions of bilateral ties while enabling both countries to retain hedging options. In essence, both countries have opted to defer and potentially **avoid an open-ended strategic competition**, though perhaps with different long-term outcomes in mind. Still, the policy consequences for the near-to-mid-term remain the same: neither leadership is prepared to incur the potential liabilities associated with an unconstrained strategic rivalry.

#### Relations resilient

Stokes 5 (Bruce, PhD, Snr Fellow – Council on Foreign Relations, National Journal, 7-16, Lexis)

As Yuan suggests, as dynamic as China appears from the outside, insiders here fret about their country's domestic  
vulnerabilities. Tens of millions of Chinese are jobless and drifting around the country with no permanent home. The possibility of an economic slowdown that might increase this number sends shivers through the leadership. Moreover, millions more work unproductively on the land. At some point, these people need to find jobs in industry and services if Chinese agriculture is ever to become more efficient. In addition, the strength of the financial system, burdened as it is by bad loans, is a constant worry. Opinions differ on how serious the problem is. Green, from Standard Chartered Bank, says there is "good reason to believe that China can get through this." But the banking system is likely to be vulnerable for years to come. All of this uncertainty exists amid an environment of mounting civil unrest. The number of demonstrations and other citizen protests has increased dramatically in the past few years, and many are aimed at the tax system and at environmental abuses. This internal political insecurity is compounded, analysts here say, by a growing wariness of U.S. meddling. Well aware of the role that Washington played in funding successful opposition groups in Ukraine and elsewhere, the already insecure Chinese leadership views Bush administration talk of democracy promotion with grave concern. For these reasons, Chinese experts on Sino-American relations welcome the new high-level dialogue between China and the U.S. that is slated to commence this summer. The talks aren't intended to solve specific problems -- such as Taiwan -- but will focus on building trust about each other's long-term geopolitical and security intentions. The Chinese would like to see the dialogue take up the expanding U.S. role in Central Asia, how Americans see their future relationship with Japan, and how to peacefully manage mutual energy needs. Although Chinese praise the dialogue as a good beginning, they do not have high expectations for the first meetings. They realize that the process will be slow. For that reason, some Chinese experts believe that there is also a need for a quick-reaction, crisis-management dialogue that would focus more specifically on emerging flash points. But they hold out little hope for such an interchange, saying the Pentagon opposes it. So the challenges facing the U.S.-China relationship, as seen from Beijing, are daunting **but manageable**. The course of events may depend on how Washington handles mounting frustration with China in the United States. "This is going to be very difficult," said Susan Shirk, a professor of political science at the University of California (San Diego). "The history of pressuring the Chinese to do things is not one of great success. When we pressure them, they dig in their heels. It turns into a contest of wills. And you can't keep any of this from the Chinese people anymore. The Internet sets the agenda, and Beijing has to react. So if we start venting, they will start to vent." Fortunately, said Kenneth G. Lieberthal, a China expert and a professor of political science at the University of Michigan, the relationship has proven **quite resilient** over the years. "We are far beyond the era when one or two issues could break the relationship," he said.

### China – AT: China/Taiwan War

#### No Chinese invasion –

#### A) U.S. deterrence

Ross 1 (Robert S., Professor of Political Science – Boston College, National Interest, Fall, Lexis)

There can never be total confidence that deterrence will work. Yet U.S. deterrence of any actual Chinese use of force against Taiwan-outside of a Taiwan declaration of independence-is highly stable. Overwhelming U.S. superiority means that the strategic, economic and political costs to China of U.S. military intervention would be astronomical. U.S. conventional superiority and its strong political commitment to Taiwan mean that the credibility of the U.S. threat to intervene is very high. In an insecure world, the U.S. deterrent posture in the Taiwan Strait is an unusually secure one.

#### B) Economics

CNA 2 (Channel News Asia, 9-17, Lexis)

Concerns over the possibility of war following the recent exchange of words between China and Taiwan are unfounded, according to analysts in the Chinese capital. Given the advanced economic integration, they believe heated words over recent remarks by the Taiwanese President may be substitutes for, rather than preludes to, military hostilities. It has been described as Taiwan's show of defiance against China's intimidation. Taiwanese President Chen Shui-bian told a pro-independence group that Taiwan was a sovereign state. He also called for a referendum to decide the island's future. Sheer audacity, according to Beijing. Li Weiyi, Spokesman for the State Council Taiwan Affairs Office, said: "He exposed his true colours when he stubbornly championed Taiwanese independence. This openly provokes all Taiwanese and Chinese. It has open defiance of the 'One-China' principle embraced by the international community." China has refused to renounce the possibility of using force to achieve reunification. It has also issued a defence White Paper that makes it clear reunification cannot be put off indefinitely. But analysts say the use of force is unthinkable, given the growing economic integration. The Chinese market accounted for almost 20 percent of Taiwan's exports last year. There are now some 25,000 Taiwanese projects in China, with a contracted investment of US$54 billion. Professor Sun Yan, Peking University, Department of International Relations, said: "Chen Shui-bian knows his comments will invite criticisms from Beijing and lead to cross-strait tensions. "He can then say that as China is hostile towards Taiwan, it is risky to invest in mainland China. His main aim is to stem the flow of investments into China and to reduce the over-reliance on China." But there's only so much that Taiwan authorities can do to stem the flow of investments. At the end of the day, in spite of the lack of direct links between the two sides, Taiwanese businessmen are still going to put money where it makes economic sense to do so. Many experts argue that close economic ties will encourage peaceful reunification. But they agree this can take place only when the political systems and economic development in China and Taiwan are more closely matched. For now, they believe the use of force is unlikely, given that China's primary focus is on internal modernisation, economic liberalisation, and increasingly, on hosting the 2008 Olympic Games. So even though heated exchanges continue, observers say Beijing understands that too much is at stake.

#### C) Chinese conventional weakness

Nolt 00 (James A., Senior Fellow – World Policy Institute, The China-Taiwan Military Balance, Taiwan Security Research, January, http://taiwansecurity.org/IS/IS-012000-Nolt.htm)

China's weak naval and air forces provide it no ability to invade Taiwan. If Taiwan were not an island, China might be able to threaten it with its large (but inefficient) army. To invade Taiwan across the 80-mile-wide Taiwan Strait, China would first have to win control of the sea and air. This would be extremely unlikely, as I argue in the next section, given Taiwan's considerable qualitative advantage in naval and air forces, even if the US did not aid Taiwan. Taiwan's qualitative advantage has increased recently. If China could gain control of the sea and air, a blockade of Taiwan might be possible, though it would almost certainly require direct confrontation with US ships defying the blockade. However, **e**ven if China somehow could gain complete control over the sea and air in the Taiwan Strait, for example, by nuclear strikes against Taiwan's naval ports and military airfields that somehow avoided US intervention, a successful invasion of Taiwan would be virtually impossible because of China limited sea and air lift capability relative to the size of the defending forces. Amphibious invasions can succeed only if the attacker can land enough troops by sea and air either to overwhelm the defender in the initial attack, or, more usually, to hang onto a beachhead long enough so that reinforcements can be landed before the defender can build up overwhelming strength to crush the beachhead. Ports are usually too strongly defended to be attacked directly, so supplies must initially be brought in by the same means as the troops: by parachute, helicopter and, mostly, by specially-built amphibious warfare vessels landing on a beach. Once a port and airports are secured and repaired, forces and supplies can be landed more efficiently using regular transports, cargo ships, and large air transports. Thus it is not the size of China's army, or even its navy or air force, that ultimately constrain its ability to invade Taiwan, but its capacity to transport troops and supplies to a hostile beach and nearby air landing sites.

### US/Canada Answers – Inevitable

#### Other factors will cause Canada to diversify

**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/>)

With the U.S. economy growing slowly for many years to come and with booming emerging markets, Canada will naturally diversify trade. The role of Canadian federal and provincial governments is therefore to make sure policies are not inhibiting trade and capital flows. Seen in this light, the Canadian government is moving in the right direction to negotiate free-trade agreements with various Asian countries as well as Europe. It should make sure its infrastructure — ports, pipelines, and transport — is in place to take advantage of these new opportunities. Canada should develop more investment and tax treaties to remove the tax and regulatory barriers that inhibit the flow of capital in new markets.

#### US/Canada relations resilient

**Ek**, 4/17/**2012** (Carl-Coordinator for the Congressional Research Service, Canada-U.S. Relations, Congressional Research Service, p. http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf)

Relations between the United States and Canada, though generally close, have undergone changes in tenor **over the past three decades**. During the 1980s, **the two countries** generally **enjoyed very good relations.** The early 1990s brought new governments to Ottawa and Washington, and although Canada’s Liberal Party emphasized its determination to act independently of the United States when necessary, relations continued to be cordial. In early 2006, a minority Conservative government assumed power in Ottawa. It was regarded as being more philosophically in tune with the George W. Bush Administration than the Liberals had been; some observers believe that this compatibility helped facilitate bilateral cooperation. This cooperation has continued with the election of President Obama in November 2008, despite the differences in the two leaders’ governing philosophies. The two North American countries continue to cooperate widely in international security and political issues, both bilaterally and through numerous international organizations. Canada’s foreign and defense policies are usually in harmony with those of the United States. Areas of contention have been relatively few, but sometimes sharp, as was the case in policy toward Iraq. Since September 11, the United States and Canada have cooperated extensively on efforts to strengthen border security and to combat terrorism, particularly in Afghanistan. Both countries were also active participants in the U.N.-sanctioned NATO mission in Libya. The United States and Canada maintain the world’s largest bilateral trading relationship, one that has been strengthened over the past two decades by the approval of two major free trade agreements. Although commercial disputes may not be quite as prominent now as they have been in the past, the two countries in recent years have engaged in difficult negotiations over items in several trade sectors, including natural resources, agricultural commodities, and intellectual property rights. The most recent clash centered around the Buy America provision of the 2009 economic stimulus law. However, these disputes affect but a small percentage of the total goods and services exchanged. In recent years, energy has increasingly emerged as a key component of the trade relationship. In addition, the United States and Canada work together closely on environmental matters, including monitoring air quality and solid waste transfers, and protecting and maintaining the quality of border waterways.

#### US/Canada relations are fine despite Keystone

Suver 2-16-12 (Roman- Research Associate for the Council on Hemispheric Affairs)

http://www.coha.org/keystone-decision-what-%E2%80%9Cdowngrade%E2%80%9D-%E2%80%93-canada-u-s-still-cozy/

While Jack Mintz presents a fairly coherent and almost convincing argument for his views on the crumbling condition of Canada-USA relations, he fails to embrace a number of important, if embarrassing truths in his analysis. If these were included, they would serve to give valuable insights into the bilateral decision-making process and the various motivations of U.S. officials, including President Obama. These additional factors, such as the realities of U.S. domestic politics, existing ties to other oil-producing nations, uncertainty over domestic energy policy, and the pending presidential election – offer a less-ominous and more practical explanation for the decision to reject the proposed design of the Keystone XL pipeline. Furthermore, these same realities reinforce the notion that it is simply untrue that any real decline in Canada-USA relations is being witnessed at all, but rather Dr. Mintz’s assertions are more alarmist exaggerations than accurate assessments.

Mintz uses the White House’s decision to reject the current Keystone XL proposal as the launching pad of his stance, in a “last straw” riposte to support the authenticity of his central notion: that this is conclusive evidence of a “downgrade” in the relations between Canada and the U.S. In reality, as with the other instances cited by Mintz, the action is more attributable to domestic American considerations rather than a message to Ottawa. As for the two main benefits of Keystone XL cited by Mintz – energy security and jobs – both are overstated in terms of their importance. With relation to the security of its energy, the U.S. would surely prefer to produce domestically in order to extend full control over supply, but nonetheless has secured long-term supply guarantees from various nations, including Saudi Arabia and Iraq – the “undesired” sources of oil at the heart of the matter. Increasing the current share of Canadian petroleum exports to the U.S. – even to the maximum capacity afforded by Keystone XL – would not have much bearing on Washington’s reliance on Middle-East crude, due to the miniscule increase in supply the pipeline would provide. Keystone XL would increase output by approximately 700,000 barrels of oil per day, which equates to a meagre one-thirtieth of current American daily domestic demand.[2][3] As such, Mintz’s (and others’) assertions that the pipeline promises to reduce dependence on Middle-East oil and heralds the arrival of energy security are not based on any realistic facts. Likewise, as has been widely documented and reported by non-partisan sources, and analyzed by independent firms free of TransCanada’s influence, the true economic impact of the pipeline has been grossly overstated by the company, its affiliates, and self-serving Republican Party candidates.[4] Their initial estimate of close to 120,000 jobs is more than 17 times higher than the U.S. State Department’s most generous estimate of 5,000-7,000 jobs.[5] The company has since recently revised its official estimate to 20,000 jobs, which is still about three times higher than the government findings indicate.[6] Both of these arguments, therefore, become much weaker when considering the facts, and point to less of a cause and incentive for American decision-makers to approve the project. While it is true that appeasing environmental groups was a consideration in President Obama’s decision, the much more important spectre of a potential environmental disaster that would accompany a contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer, and the subsequent forced relocation of Americans, makes the matter a much larger bona fide political issue. The more one examines the multifarious nature of the U.S. domestic debate on the issue and the far-flung implications of approving the current route, the more it becomes fully apparent that the decision was rooted firmly in consideration of American interests, with Canadian corporate contentment as largely a secondary thought. Rather than being an indicator of U.S. affinity towards the Great White North, the decision was merely a practical one for the U.S., and hardly signals a “downgrade” or referendum on relations. After all, as Mintz stated, Canada is the U.S.’s largest trading partner, and will continue to be for the foreseeable future.

### Ext – US/Canada Relations Fine

#### **US-Canada Relations Still Good – Despite Keystone**

**White** 6-14-**12** (Keith Edmund- Editor in chief of CUSLI News Nexus, former operations director for presidential campaigns, member of the Debating Union) http://www.cuslinexus.com/2012/06/nytimes-gets-it-wrong-keystone-xl.html

Now if you read Rosenthal’s piece that point was probably lost one you: since the entire narrative she constructs comes awfully close to: ‘The U.S. Rejection of Canada’s Pipeline Jeopardizes the Canada-U.S. Energy Relationship.’ Sure, the Keystone rejection was driven by domestic politics, and did come at an economic cost to the United States. But the scale of this cost seems rather minimal: (1) Canada was pushing a pipeline in the US to avoid its own domestic opposition to westward pipelines in Canada, (2) the U.S.-Canada energy relationship (whether in terms of oil supply, refinery operations, or construction of pipelines) is still ongoing and growing, and (3) work on Keystone continues. And the environmental concerns that led Obama to ‘cave’ to an interest group, well guess what? There even stronger in Canada.

#### US and Canada Relations are Strong

**Government of Canada**, 3/22/**11** (Canada and the United States: No two nations closer, The Government of Canada, p. http://www.canadainternational.gc.ca/can-am/Closer-etroites.aspx?view=d)

But the true strength and resilience of the relationship is perhaps best illustrated when Canada and the U.S. disagree. As sovereign nations, with at times divergent interests, the two countries are sometimes confronted by difficult issues. Disagreements, such as those on softwood lumber and on beef imports, have tested the relationship. But on every occasion, because they are good neighbors and have so much in common, solutions have been found. At its core, **the Canada-U.S. relationship is** so **strong**, so mutually important, that the two nations realize the common interests that unite them are far greater than the irritants that may momentarily divide them.

#### US-Canada Relations Among the Closest in the World

**Covais, 2005** (Ronald, On Board of Directors for The Canadian American Business Council and The Canada-US Fulbright Program, past-Vice President, International Operations, for Lockheed Martin Corporation’s International Business Development, Furthering U.S. – Canada Relations, Frontline Defense, <http://www.frontline-canada.com/Defence/index_archives.php?page=1881>)

There will certainly continue to be times when Canada and the U.S. disagree. No relationship with the depth, complexity and scale of these two countries’ can be trouble-free. But the positive aspects of the relationship far outweigh the negative—and enable the two countries to work together to overcome them.

Political and other differences will occur from time to time – this is to be expected especially in the post September 11, 2001 environment. But we should never lose sight of the key issue – the “overall relationship” between our two nations. The resilience, the importance and the spirit of our relationship has always, and will always bring us back to being good partners.

Canadians and Americans have developed a working relationship, a modus operandi, that has fostered a cooperative bilateral relationship that is among the closest and most extensive in the world. It has traditionally been based on defense and trade.

### US/Canada Answers – AT: Quebec Secession

#### Quebec will not succeed from Canada under any circumstance

**The Canadian Press**, 4/24/**12**, (The Canadian Press- Top Canadian News, Ignatieff backpedals on Quebec secession, http://www.ctvnews.ca/ignatieff-backpedals-on-quebec-secession-1.800309#axzz1z1vAuqta)

MONTREAL - Michael Ignatieff has clarified he doesn't actually believe Quebec's secession from Canada is inevitable. The former Liberal leader was forced to backpedal Tuesday after his prediction of Canada's eventual breakup was repudiated by federalist allies, the party he used to lead and, most directly, by his former college roommate, old friend and erstwhile leadership rival, Bob Rae. "Nothing is inevitable in politics and nothing would be so undesirable as separation," Ignatieff said in an email to The Canadian Press. In an attached letter to the editor of the Globe and Mail newspaper, Ignatieff proclaimed his unwavering belief in Canadian unity. "Remarks of mine, taken out of context in an interview with BBC Scotland, have caused some distress to federalist friends across the country, both francophone and anglophone," he wrote. "Since I passionately want Quebec to remain part of the Canadian fabric and since these friends have defended this idea with courage and pride, it causes me pain to think that anything I said could be used against a cause -- the national unity of my country -- that they and I hold dear." Ignatieff went on say he opposes the separation of Quebec from Canada, as well as that of Scotland from the United Kingdom, and that any threat to unity must be met with "determination and resolve." If he failed to make his views clear in the BBC interview, Ignatieff added, "I can only re-affirm them now to my federalist friends across Canada and repeat that I will never betray the cause that we share." The volte face followed a day in which Ignatieff's interview was hailed by Quebec separatists, denounced by federalists and used by Conservatives and New Democrats to try to further sideline the Liberal party, which has long portrayed itself as the party of national unity. Ignatieff told the BBC that Canada underwent a "pretty radical devolution" of powers to Quebec after the near-death experience in the 1995 referendum. He called decentralization "a kind of way station." "You stop there for a while but I think the logic eventually is independence, full independence." Citing Quebec's control over immigration, natural resource development, health and education, he also said that Canada and Quebec are effectively "almost two separate countries" already. Rae, the interim Liberal leader, didn't mince words when asked about Ignatieff's thesis. "I think that's completely wrong, on two counts," Rae said. He noted Canada has always been a relatively decentralized federation and said Ignatieff's assertion that Quebec gained radical new powers after the 1995 referendum is "just factually incorrect." Rae said provinces have always had jurisdiction over health, education and natural resources. "That's called the Constitution of Canada. That was passed in 1867." Rae also categorically rejected Ignatieff's prediction that Quebec's secession is inevitable. "I don't think that in any way, shape or form separation is inevitable. Quite the opposite. I think a glorious future for Canada and Quebec lies in a great federation which Canada is. And I actually don't think Michael Ignatieff thinks it is either." Rae said Ignatieff sent him an email first thing Tuesday morning "saying that he hoped no one would think that he thought that the dissolution of the country was inevitable, he never thought that at all." Other federalist allies were equally puzzled by Ignatieff's remarks. "What I will tell you is a strong majority of Quebecers believe in Canada," Quebec Premier Jean Charest said in Montreal. He agreed with Ignatieff -- that the country is a decentralized federation -- and he said "important progress" has been made on that score since he took office nine years ago. But he said he hadn't heard Ignatieff's interview so he couldn't comment further. A poll on Quebecers' attitudes, coincidentally, appeared in Tuesday's Montreal La Presse newspaper. It pegged support for independence at 36 per cent -- well below the historic highs of the early 1990s and even lower than the level in the first sovereignty referendum, more than three decades ago. The CROP online poll of 1,000 Quebecers was conducted from April 18 to 23. Ignatieff's BBC interview prompted a gleeful response from Quebec sovereigntists Tuesday. The Bloc Quebecois praised Ignatieff for having travelled Canada, observing it, and finally understanding that it deserved to be two separate countries. Parti Quebecois Leader Pauline Marois also had high praise: "In my opinion, he remains a high-level intellectual." But federalists in Quebec City and Ottawa worked to play down the remarks. Stephane Dion, longtime unity warrior and one-time Liberal leader whom Ignatieff replaced at the helm of the party, suggested Ignatieff was simply voicing frustration that everyone in the country feels from time to time. But he said the result of sticking together is worth it. "Sometimes, all of us may have moments of doubt -- and after a while we keep hope that we'll keep our country together and we continue to fight for it," Dion, now the Liberals' intergovernmental affairs critic, said in an interview. Dion dismissed suggestions Ignatieff's comments will give a boost to the separatist cause. "It doesn't strengthen at all the argumentation for secession that is very weak. And it's important for all of us, and I'm sure Mr. Ignatieff will do it, to explain why it's weak and not the right solution for Quebecers, as well as for all Canadians." Contrary to Ignatieff's view that radical decentralization is a "way station" on the road to secession, Dion noted that there has always been a "lively debate" over whether Canada is too centralized or decentralized. He said he believes the flexible, decentralized nature of Canada's federation has actually made it a model to the rest of the world. "I'm very pleased to be in a decentralized federation where we Quebecers have a kind of a universe of our own, where other Canadians are welcome but not very active. "It's part of what Canada is and it's fine with me because I know that when it's the time to act together and to build something together, Quebecers and westerners and other Canadians, well, we're great." Dion said political differences in the country -- such as regional ones pitting East against West -- are greatly exaggerated and magnified by Canada's electoral system. He said the first-past-the-post system hides the fact that many Albertans, for instance, are left-leaning while many Quebecers lean right.

## Environment Offense

### Environment 1NC

#### **Keystone XL bad for the environment --- increases emissions and oil spills**

Turner, 2-24-12 (Ted- Founder and Chairman of the United Nations Foundation, founder of the Nuclear Test Initiative) “Stop Keystone Pipeline before it’s too late” <http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/22/opinion/turner-keystone-pipeline/index.html>

I own a property in Fort Pierre, South Dakota, called the Bad River Ranch. It is a beautiful place, where we have worked very hard to restore the landscape, reintroduce native wildlife species and raise bison sustainably. But it sits about 15 miles downstream of the point where TransCanada's proposed Keystone XL pipeline would cross the Bad River, and being that close has led me to examine more closely the potential risks and benefits of a project about which I have been highly skeptical from the beginning. After careful scrutiny, I believe it is not in our national interest to pursue it. The purpose of Keystone XL is to bring tar sands crude oil through the United States to Gulf Coast refineries. The route through the United States is actually the oil industry's second choice: Transporting the oil west from Alberta to the Pacific Coast would be shorter and much cheaper, but Canadians concerned about environmental impacts and threats to native people's lands are challenging that route, and with good reason. The existing and potential environmental impacts along the 2,000-mile pipeline route are profound. In Canada, extraction of tar sands crude requires clear-cutting thousands of acres of boreal forests, diverting rivers, strip-mining, and destroying critical habitat for some of the largest populations of woodland caribou left in the world. Thirty percent of North America's songbirds and 40% of its waterfowl rely on the wetlands and waterways of the boreal forest. Tar sands oil production has already created more than 50 square miles of toxic waste ponds so massive they are visible from space. Even more important, tar sands oil extraction produces three times more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional oil and gas, putting even greater strain on our atmosphere and oceans, which have little absorptive capacity left. Ted Turner Closer to home, the pipeline presents an immediate threat to drinking water for millions and to the livelihood of farmers and ranchers. To transport via pipeline, the thick tar sands crude must be mixed with toxic chemicals and then pumped at extreme temperature and pressure. This sets the stage for more pipeline failures and spills that create a highly toxic mess. The existing Keystone 1 tar sands pipeline has spilled more than 12 times in its first 12 months of operation. In July 2010, a spill of more than 800,000 gallons of toxic tar sands crude from the Enbridge pipeline contaminated more than 30 miles of water and shoreline along the Kalamazoo River in Michigan. This created public health problems, threats to groundwater, widespread fish kills, and destruction of wildlife habitat, contamination that is still being cleaned up at a cost exceeding $700 million. Downstream landowners like me are thinking this is a preview of coming attractions if Keystone XL is built. Cutting through the Keystone XL hysteria, the potential for pollution of vital groundwater from the Keystone XL pipeline is even more frightening. Depending on the final route of the pipeline, spills would threaten the Ogallala Aquifer, the largest aquifer in the western North American region, upon which millions of people and agricultural businesses depend for drinking water, irrigation and livestock watering. But spills anywhere along the route would threaten crucial drinking water supplies, from local and municipal drinking water wells to the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in Texas, a critical water supply for drought-stricken East Texas and Houston. Anyone with even a passing familiarity with the water scarcity problems in that region should understand how a sizable pipeline failure could have catastrophic consequences.

### Emissions Turn

#### Processing of oil sands would increase CO2 emissions

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)

The oil sands formation in western Canada, sometimes referred to as tar sands because of the density of the extracted oil, contains an estimated 1.75 trillion barrels of recoverable oil, the second-largest known deposit of oil in the world after Saudi Arabia’s. Extracting, transporting and refining it, however, is energy intensive, producing 15 percent to 80 percent more carbon emissions over its life cycle than average petroleum products. Thus James Hansen, an eminent climatologist at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has warned that if development of the oil sands deposits goes forward unchecked it means “game over,” in his words, for the global climate. Removing and burning all that oil, Dr. Hansen has warned, would spew so much carbon dioxide into the atmosphere that it would be impossible to stabilize the climate and avoid disastrous global impacts.

### Ext – Tar Sand Increases Emissions

#### Burning tarsands from Keystone would be game over on climate change

**McKibben**, 2/24/**2012** (Bill – author of The End of Nature, Beyond Keystone, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bill-mckibben/beyond-keystone-_b_1300155.html>)

But the second study made clear to tarsands opponents -- if it hadn't been already -- that this was only one battle in a much larger fight. A new study from a pair of British Columbia scientists shows that there's a lot of carbon in the tarsands -- but a lot more yet in the planet's coal deposits. If you burned all the tarsands we know about now, you'd raise the planet's temperature more than half a degree -- i.e., half again as much as the global warming we've already seen, which has been enough to make the seas 30% more acid and cut Arctic sea ice 40%. But if you burned all the coal we know about it, the temperature would go up 15 degrees. At a certain point, I suppose, it doesn't matter -- most scientists think anything more than two degrees Celsius puts us into a zone of extreme danger, and we're already halfway there. Fifteen degrees would be just gilding the lily. Still, it makes it clear that even if, as NASA's James Hansen has said, burning the planet's unconventional fuels like tarsands would mean it was "game over for the climate," stopping that burning won't be enough. We also have to address the most obvious, conventional forms of energy -- coal, especially. It was the first kind of fossil fuel we learned to burn, 300 years ago. And we've got to kick the habit. Which is why, even as the political gamesmanship over the Keystone pipeline rages on (with the GOP at the moment making the absurd claim that this export pipeline will lower U.S. pump prices), we've got no choice but to take on other battles. 350.org has been embroiled these last weeks in the fight over a massive new coal plant in Kosovo; closer to home, plans were just announced for a truly massive new coal port in Washington State that would take eight mile-long coal trains a day from the Powder River Basin of Montana and Wyoming and ship them straight to China. We've got to stop projects like this, just as we united to fight Keystone. In fact, we've got -- as soon as possible -- to stop fighting bad things one by one. We don't have enough fingers to plug every hole in the dike; we need to change the basic underlying economics, by charging the fossil fuel industry for the damage carbon does in the atmosphere instead of just letting them continue to use the atmosphere as an open sewer for free.

#### Tar Sands Hurt Climate --- increases emissions

Kohn, 1/18/2012 (Sally, political Commentator, Six reasons Keystone XL was a bad deal all along, p. www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along/)

Assuming you believe, like the vast majority of the world’s scientists, that climate change is both real and of concern, the Canadian tar sands are the second largest carbon reserve in the world. Mining these reserves would release all of that carbon into the atmosphere, to detrimental effect on our environment. Sure, Canada might go ahead and mine the tar sands anyway, but the United States doesn’t have to help pollute the planet and our own states in the process. No matter how you look at it, the Keystone XL proposal was a slimy, scam of a deal. America is better than that. We can create good-paying jobs that build our families and our economy for the future without hurting our environment today. We can invest in innovative energy technology that not only reduces our dependence on dirty fuel but also puts us in the lead in critical, emerging markets. We can prioritize good jobs and a competitive economy of the future, with all the upsides of American energy production and innovation and far, far fewer of the downsides that Keystone carried.

### Clean Energy Turn 1NC

#### Keystone XL prevents a transition to clean energy

**Swift 2012** (Anthony- Energy Analyst at the National Resource Defense Council, BA in political science and biology) “Keystone XL: A Tar Sands Pipeline to Increase Oil Prices” http://www.nrdc.org/energy/keystone-pipeline/files/Keystone-Oil-Prices-Report.pdf

One of the most misunderstood issues surrounding the proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is the project’s impact on U.S. gasoline prices. The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline would pump up to 830,000 barrels per day (bpd) of some of the world’s dirtiest oil, which is strip mined and drilled from under Canada’s Boreal forests, straight through the heart of America’s breadbasket to refineries on the Texas Gulf Coast. By allowing tar sands access to the lucrative international market, Keystone XL would finance further expansion of tar sands extraction, worsening climate change and undermining efforts to move to clean energy.

#### Clean energy progress is key to prevent climate change and extinction

**Wood 10** (Duncan, Director – Program in International Relations and Canadian Studies Program – Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, “Environment, Development and Growth: U.S.-Mexico Cooperation in Renewable Energies,” Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars – Mexico Institute, May, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/pubs/U.S.%20Mexico%20Cooperation%20in%20Renewable%20Energies.pdf)

It is by now common knowledge that the world is facing a climate change crisis caused by the effects of fossil fuel driven industrialization. A significant rise in global temperatures, combined with more severe weather conditions, more frequent floods and droughts, are bringing a paradigm shift to the way we think about our relationship with the planet. For the first time in over 150 years policy makers are thinking seriously about decreasing dependency on fossil fuels and looking for alternatives that may be more expensive in the short and medium terms, but ultimately more sustainable. 7 All of this has happened at the same time as two other, related phenomena. The first is that the global population is reaching new highs and by 2040‐50 will total over 9 billion people. Experts predict that 85% of the world’s population will be located in the developing world, which will mean a rapidly growing demand for goods and for energy. Both of these factors will result in a need to increase energy efficiency as well as find new sources of energy. What’s more, this massive jump in population will coincide not only with climate change but also with increasingly difficult conditions for hydrocarbons exploration and production. As most of the world’s “easy” oil has already been discovered, oil companies and nation states are turning to alternatives such a non‐conventional oil reserves (tar sands, complex fields) and reserves that in the past would have been considered unrecoverable, such as in very deep ocean waters. Furthermore, political conditions in many of the world’s oil rich regions are uncertain, unstable and often unfriendly to private oil companies and to the countries of the West. Climate change and natural disasters The urgency of finding alternatives to fossil fuels has been confirmed in recent years by mounting scientific evidence that we are undergoing a noticeable **anthropogenic shift** in the world’s weather and temperature. Not only are a range of indicators showing that the planet is warming, but the retreat of the polar ice caps, the melting of glaciers, and most importantly in the short term extreme weather conditions and increased incidence of natural disasters have highlighted the consequences of maintaining the status quo in our patterns of energy consumption and industrial development. It is estimated that we have experienced a 1 degree Celsius rise in global temperatures over the past 100 years and that by the end of the current century global temperatures may have risen by as much 7 or 8 degrees. Even with the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions that is contemplated by the most ambitious mitigation strategies, global temperatures may rise by as much as 6%. This would have a dramatic and disastrous impact on both developed and developing nations and will **threaten the existence of both humans and animal and plant species**. Though the connection between man‐made greenhouse gases and global warming was denied for many years by industry and governments alike, it has now been accepted that something must be done to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere. Given that 86% of all global energy comes from fossil fuels, and that these fossil fuels produce 27,000,000,000 tons of CO2 emissions annually, finding alternative sources of energy is a crucial component of climate change mitigation strategies.

### Ext – Keystone Kills Clean Energy

#### Tar sand oil will be exported at the cost of renewable energy efforts and won’t benefit American citizens

Droitsch 1/11/2012 (Danielle-Director at the Natural Resources Defense Council, Don't be fooled - the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is not a jobs plan, but an oil export plan, Natural Resources Defense Council p. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ddroitsch/dont\_be\_fooled\_-\_the\_keystone.html)

Steven M. Anderson, retired Army brigadier general, argues the Keystone XL pipeline will not help America cut its petro-addition and will detract from building a clean energy economy: This pipeline would move dirty oil from Canada to refineries in Texas and would set back our renewable energy efforts for at least two decades, much to our enemies’ delight. It would ensure we maintain our oil addiction and delay making the tough decisions regarding energy production, management and conservation that we need to start making today. The laser-focus emphasis on Keystone XL by House Republicans, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and others is nothing short of politics. They are conveniently avoiding a more important point about how the Keystone XL pipeline that provides tar sands oil companies a platform to export oil while making billions of dollars in profit. Instead, the pipeline will take the dirtiest oil on the planet, put America’s heartland at risk, and then send that oil to the highest bidder around the world. Building pipelines to the Gulf Coast, in addition to providing oil companies an avenue to export, also increases oil prices. There is concrete evidence (pp. 27-28) that building Keystone XL will increase oil prices in the Gulf Coast Market and the Midwest. In the end, real job creation won’t come from approving a foreign pipeline. The evidence shows the future of job creation is in global clean energy markets. And that the real purpose of this pipeline is to give tar sands producers access to international markets.

### Ogallala Aquifer Turn

#### Keystone will pollute the Ogallala Aquifer

**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)

The proposed Keystone XL pipeline, which would have been built from northwest Canada to Texas, was delayed in November after the Obama administration faced an avalanche of protest from environmentalists. Central to environmentalists' argument against the pipeline is a concern that it would cut near the Ogallala Aquifer and a potential leak would be catastrophe to a major water source for the Midwest. Several Nebraska Republicans--including Gov. Dave Heineman--also opposed that route. Canadian environmentalists are voicing similar concerns about the alternative route. The Toronto Star reports that the western route faces fierce opposition from environmentalists in Canada who say that pipeline leaks or a tanker spill would endanger some of the world's most pristine forests and coastal areas and that the proposal "has already galvanized unprecedented concern in the green movement."

#### Ogallala aquifer is key to prevent extinction

**Zellmer**, April **2008** (Sandra – professor of law and co-director of the Water Resources Research Initiative at the University of Nebraska, Book Review: Boom and Bust on the Great Plains: Déjà vu All Over Again, Creighton Law Review, 41 Creighton L. Rev. 385, p. Lexis)

CONCLUSION "Water is life ... . Each drop is a benediction." **[226](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=5ca22556739c0dbf0094992298b1fb13&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlW-zSkAA&_md5=5047c25d96ac9b82471c79ddcde4f047" \l "n226" \t "_self)** Reforms - especially agricultural reforms - are hard to come by. According to Jim Lyons, a former U.S. Agriculture Under Secretary, "the big commodity groups have a stranglehold on policy. And there's not a lot of stomach for new ideas." **[227](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=5ca22556739c0dbf0094992298b1fb13&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlW-zSkAA&_md5=5047c25d96ac9b82471c79ddcde4f047" \l "n227" \t "_self)** William Ashworth points out, however, that the depletion of the Ogallala Aquifer is an impending crisis that **we ignore at our own peril**. **[228](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=5ca22556739c0dbf0094992298b1fb13&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlW-zSkAA&_md5=5047c25d96ac9b82471c79ddcde4f047" \l "n228" \t "_self)** Given that the aquifer produces **around twenty percent of the U.S. harvest**, **the ripple effects of its demise could be cataclysmic, nationally and even internationally**. **[229](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=5ca22556739c0dbf0094992298b1fb13&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlW-zSkAA&_md5=5047c25d96ac9b82471c79ddcde4f047" \l "n229" \t "_self)**

### Ext – Keystone Leaks

#### Keystone XL Prone to Leaks

**Kasper**, 6/22/**12** (Matt, Special Assistant for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, Major Oil Spills In Alberta Prompt Questions And Concerns About Keystone XL Pipeline, p. http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/06/22/504520/major-oil-spills-in-alberta-prompt-questions-and-concerns-about-keystone-xl-pipeline/)

TransCanada’s own analysis shows that the Keystone XL pipeline would have 11 “significant spills” over its 50-year lifecycle, while an independent study estimated that there could be as many as 91 spills. The first leg of the Keystone pipeline even suffered 12 spills in 2010 – a record for a pipeline’s first year in operation.

### Ext – Oil Spills Hurt Ogallala

#### **KXL Leaks, Bad for the Environment**

Kohn, 1/18/2012 (Sally, political Commentator, Six reasons Keystone XL was a bad deal all along, p. www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along/)

The pipeline that the Obama administration has rejected the permit for would be an extension of a pipeline that has already leaked -- not just once, but 12 times in the last year. While TransCanada tried to dismiss these leaks as “minor” averaging “just five to 10 gallons of oil” each, the leak on May 7, 2011 near Millner, N.D., spilled about 21,000 gallons of oil in total. Nebraska’s Republican Governor Dave Heineman strongly opposed the Keystone XL project because the pipeline would run through a massive and vital aquifer in his state the supplies clean drinking water to over 2 million Americans plus water that fuels the region’s agriculture industry. Building the pipeline might have created a few thousand temporary jobs but even a minor oil spill in or near the aquifer would have jeopardized hundreds of thousands of jobs, not to mention the health and safety of millions. Meanwhile, in Michigan where a similar tar sands pipeline spilled over 840,000 gallons of crude oil into the Kalamazoo River in 2010, residents are still complaining of headaches, dizziness and nausea while studies continue to look at the long-term effects of just being near such an oil spill when it happens.