## \*\*Inherency\*\*

## Passage Inevitable

**Keystone inevitable – will pass after election**

**Lyon** 3 – 19 – **12** (John, Arkansas News Bureau, “Pryor: Keystone pipeline approval likely after election”, <http://arkansasnews.com/2012/03/19/pryor-keystone-pipeline-approval-likely-after-election/> ck)

The Keystone XL crude oil pipeline has been caught up in presidential politics but likely will be approved after the November election, U.S. Sen. Mark Pryor, D-Ark., said today. Pryor spoke to reporters during a visit to the Little Rock plant of Welspun, a pipe manufacturer that is expected to supply half the steel for the proposed pipeline that would carry oil from Canada’s oil sands to the U.S. Gulf Coast. “The truth is it is a presidential election year, and it’s gotten wrapped up in some of the presidential politics,” Pryor said. “I think both sides have kind of brought that on. But I think the bottom line is after the elections it’s going to be approved, it’s going to go forward.”

**Keystone will pass after election – bipart support absent domestic politics**

**Myhre** 6 – 25 – **12** (Jeff, reporter for the Forgien Policy Association, “Alberta’s New Energy Minister on the Keystone XL Pipeline”, <http://foreignpolicyblogs.com/2012/06/25/albertas-energy-minister-keystone-xl-pipeline/> ck)

Kensington: Do you see the recent delays as US domestic politics getting in the way of the inevitable construction of the pipeline? Or is there a chance it won’t be built at all? Minister Hughes: Alberta is confident that after the political season is over in the U.S., there will be bipartisan support for Keystone XL. We were pleased that last month President Obama’s office stated that it supports TransCanada’s application to build the first leg of this pipeline from Cushing to the Gulf Coast, and that they are committed to taking every step possible to expedite the necessary federal permits. We were also pleased to hear that TransCanada has reapplied for a Presidential Permit for the Keystone XL pipeline to be built across the Canada-U.S. border. While we respect and understand that approval of the pipeline is a U.S. domestic matter, Alberta believes very strongly in the merits and benefits of this pipeline. Alberta is the safest, most secure and responsible source of oil for the United States and we are optim;istic that the project will be evaluated on facts and not on rhetoric.

## Obama Will Approve – Before Election

**Obama will pass keystone shortly before the election**

**Sheffield** 4 – 5 – **12** (Matthew, president of Dialog New Media – marketing, technology, and campaigning consultation group, reporter for CNS news, “Look For Obama To Approve Keystone Pipeline - Right Before The Election”, <http://cnsnews.com/blog/matthew-sheffield/look-obama-approve-keystone-pipeline-right-election> ck)

The geography of the proposed pipeline is another reason Obama will reverse his position shortly before the election. The currently planned pipeline route passes through Missouri, a swing state. It also passes very close by Iowa, a state which Obama won in 2008, also a swing state. While the pipes won't go directly through Iowa, they will be close enough that many Iowa residents and businesses stand to benefit from its construction. The same is true for Minnesota, another Obama state in 2008 that he must keep to remain in the White House. With the election still seven months away, Obama and the Democrats can still play politics with the issue, trying to deflect it with nonsensical issues like barring oil companies from using the same standard tax deductions available to all manufacturers. That issue allows Obama to demagogue the oil companies, though raising their taxes would make gasoline prices go up, not down. But as Election Day nears, with gas prices still high, approving Keystone will be the only surefire way left for Obama to cause an immediate decrease in oil futures, leading to a price decrease at the pump – and allowing Obama to claim to be “doing something” about the price of gasoline. Can one be certain of this prediction? Of course not, but if Obama is as keenly focused on his reelection as the reports have said--he prioritizes it above everything else--he's very likely to approve Keystone XL.

## Romney Will Approve

**Romney will do the plan**

Rowell 12 (Andy Rowell, Oil Change International, "Keystone XL Becoming Key Election Issue," 2/1/12 pg online @ priceofoil.org/2012/02/01/keystone-xl-becoming-key-election-issue//arjun)

“If President Obama gets re-elected, he may approve the pipeline. If President Obama is not re-elected, the pipeline will absolutely get approved because all of the Republican candidates have indicated they are very much in favour of it,” Wilkins added. All the leading Republican candidates have become vocal on the issue, pushing what one pundit calls “petro-populism”. In his “State of the Union response,” a speech given in Tampa under a giant “Obama isn’t working” banner, Mitt Romney called Keystone, “a real ‘shovel-ready’ project that would put 20,000 Americans back to work.”

**Romney victory makes Keystone a sure thing**

**Anderson** 7 – 9 – **12** (Dale, reporter for the Pearson Online Learning Exchange Election series – a teacher resource regarding the election, “Will the Election Bring A Pipeline of Energy Or Disaster?”, <http://olecommunity.com/election/how-will-the-2012-election-affect-the-keystone-xl-pipeline/> ck)

Assuming the president returns for a second term, what will his administration then decide? If TransCanada has indeed diverted the pipeline away from the sensitive Ogallala Aquifer, the State Department’s chief objection would seem to be addressed. Indeed, many environmentalists—albeit glumly—seem to expect approval of the northern pipeline. Should Obama lose the 2012 election, Keystone XL is almost **certain to become a reality**. Republican Mitt Romney began running an ad earlier this spring stating his intention to approve the project on his first day in the White House.

## Decision After Election

**Keystone decision will be put off until after the election**

**Chicago Tribune** **News** **6 – 20** – 12 (“Approve the pipeline”, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-20/news/ct-edit-pipeline-0620-jm-20120620_1_pipeline-inspections-keystone-xl-keystone-pipeline> ck)

In a sop to its eco-green political base, though, the administration of President Barack Obama blocked the Keystone pipeline in January. Now the project is under review again at theU.S. State Department, which has jurisdiction because the pipeline would cross our border with Canada. Last week, the diplomats announced plans to make a final decision on the project by the first quarter of 2013 — a date that not coincidentally puts off the issue until after the Nov. 6 election.

**Despite gains Keystone won’t come up to vote till mid 2013**

**Alic** **7 – 4 –** 12(Jen, reporter for 24/7 Wall St, “How is the Keystone XL Pipeline Progressing?”,

<http://247wallst.com/2012/07/04/how-is-the-keystone-xl-pipeline-progressing/> ck)

Four and a half years of studies and five failed votes in the House later, exactly where are we with the Keystone XL pipeline? Stuck on the US-Canadian border where it is likely to remain until mid-2013 despite the headline-grabbing issuance of one of three permits to begin construction in Texas for the smaller and much less controversial portion of the pipeline.

**Keystone won’t pass – senate blocks and Obama will reserve judgment till after election**

**Restuccia** 6 – 21 – **12** (Andrew, reporter for Politico, “Legislative mixup sets back Keystone XL bid”, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0612/77710.html> ck)

The House has already voted to approve the pipeline five times. Three of the five votes were on Terry’s bill. But efforts to approve Keystone face an uphill battle in the Senate and are unlikely to be signed into law by President Barack Obama, who has reserved judgment on the pipeline until his administration completes its ongoing review. The White House has said it will veto Keystone if it is in the transportation bill.

## \*\*Oil Dependency \*\*

## AT: Energy Security

**Keystone can’t solve energy security**

**Oil Change International 2012** (lobbying group for clean energy, “Keystone XL Does Not Enhance U.S. Energy Security”, <http://priceofoil.org/keystone-xl-and-energy-security/> ck)

What is energy security? Essentially, energy security is based on two prime concepts: • Protection against energy supply disruption; • Protection against energy price volatility. In addition, when we talk about oil, we often hear the following related concerns expressed: • Oil revenue flows to hostile regimes and dependence on those regimes for oil; • Foreign policy consequences of dependence on oil from hostile regimes; • Sustainability of oil supply: climate change and environmental impacts. Does Keystone XL address any of these concerns? The answer is an emphatic NO! Essentially, the global nature of the oil market undermines Keystone XL’s impact on any of these issues. There will not be fewer imports from the Middle East, hostile regimes will not be hampered by a reduction in oil revenues and the U.S. will be no more insulated from global oil price spikes as it was in 2008 or in April/May 2011, when global events caused gas prices to spike despite record imports from Canada.

## AT: Reduce Oil Dependency

**Plan fails – can’t decrease demand – still vulnerable to world price hikes**

**Levi** **1 – 18** – 12 (Michael, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of the council’s program on energy security and climate change, “Five myths about the Keystone XL pipeline”, The Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-myths-about-the-keystone-xl-pipeline/2011/12/19/gIQApUAX8P_story_1.html> ck)

2. The pipeline would have reduced U.S. reliance on oil from the Middle East. Worries about dependence on Middle Eastern oil have long animated U.S. energy policy — and the Keystone XL pipeline would have transported more than half as much oil each year as the United States currently imports annually from Saudi Arabia. But **U.S. vulnerability to turmoil in the Middle East is linked to how much oil we consume, not where we buy it from**. The price of oil is set on world markets: When convulsions in Libya sent the price of crude up 30 percent last year, prices for Canadian heavy oil (similar to what is produced from oil sands) rose by nearly 55 percent. Some pipeline proponents also pointed out that Canadian oil currently sells at a discount compared with oil supplies from the rest of the world. Keystone XL, however, wouldn’t have led Canada to start offering greater amounts of crude at reduced prices — instead, Canadian producers would have gained more leverage and would have been able to sell their oil at the world price.

**Doesn’t Solve Oil Dependence**

Kohn 12 (Sally Kohn, "Six reasons Keystone XL was a bad deal all along," 1/18/2012 pg online @ [**www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along///arjun**](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along///arjun))

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 oversees markets where oil fetches a higher price (and thus turns a higher profit for the company).

**Shift to Canadian oil fails – still dependent and vulnerable to oil spikes – empirically proven**

**Oil Change International 2012** (lobbying group for clean energy, “Keystone XL Does Not Enhance U.S. Energy Security”, <http://priceofoil.org/keystone-xl-and-energy-security/> ck)

Canada has been America’s largest source of oil imports since 2005. Today the United States imports over 2.5 million barrels per day (Mb/d) of crude oil and petroleum products from Canada. This is more than double the imports from Saudi Arabia and 38% more than current imports from all Persian Gulf states. **Yet this increasing reliance on Canadian oil has not protected America from oil price spikes**. In 2008, as oil hit $147 per barrel, U.S. gasoline prices spiked over $4 per gallon. In 2011, when the Libyan crisis took about 1.6 Mb/d out of the global oil market, U.S. gasoline prices jumped 26% in two months despite U.S. stocks of crude oil hitting record highs. **The dominance of Canadian oil in the U.S. market provided no buffer against the vagaries of the global oil market** on these occasions. Canadian oil will not significantly decrease OPEC revenues It feels good to send oil money to Canada rather than to hostile regimes that threaten America. But does it make a difference? According to the EIA, OPEC countries are likely to earn over $1 trillion in 2011 from oil exports, rising slightly in 2012. The International Energy Agency forecasts that by 2035, under a business as usual scenario in which tar sands production grows in line with industry ambitions, OPEC’s share of the global oil market will rise from 41% to 52%. With 77% of the world’s proven oil reserves, OPEC producers will always dominate the world’s oil market. **That the U.S. is buying more oil from Canada matters little to OPEC producers**. Canada pumping more oil allows them to pump less in order to maintain high prices. Revenues to OPEC are therefore likely to be stable with or without Canadian oil.

**Oil prices depend on amount of global oil – Canada not key**

**Levi** **1 – 18** – 12 (Michael, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of the council’s program on energy security and climate change, “Five myths about the Keystone XL pipeline”, The Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-myths-about-the-keystone-xl-pipeline/2011/12/19/gIQApUAX8P_story_1.html> ck)

If we don’t build the pipeline and buy their oil, the Canadians will sell it to China. So what? World **oil prices depend on how much oil is produced — not who sells what to whom**. Whether the United States or China buys oil at the world price from Canada or Brazil or Saudi Arabia or Nigeria won’t affect U.S. economic fortunes. Some argue that buying oil from Canada rather than elsewhere would shrink the yawning U.S. trade deficit, since Canadians are more likely than others to spend their petro-profits in the United States. But **Canada** gets richer no matter whether it sells its oil to American or Chinese consumers, and its newfound **wealth spills over to the U.S. economy regardless**. What ultimately matters to our economy is not whether the United States or China buys oil from Canada — it’s whether Canada produces and sells that oil at all. The fate of the Keystone XL pipeline will be of limited consequence to either long-term U.S. energy security or climate change (though its rejection will probably be ugly for U.S.-Canada relations). The Keystone decision ultimately became far more about symbolism than substance. It’s a shame that so much attention was diverted from things that matter more.

**Canada oil trade doesn’t insulate the US from the global market**

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/keystone-xl-pipeline-creates-sticking-point-in-us-canada-trade-relations/2012/07/06/gJQAxcrtRW_story.html>

But reduced reliance on imports from outside North America would not insulate the United States from geopolitical crises in other oil-producing regions. When it comes to oil prices, **the increased reliance on Canada will make little or no difference**. The price of crude oil is a function of world supply and demand. And if a geopolitical crisis choked off some of the world’s oil sources, other consuming countries would scramble for supplies, and prices would soar globally, including the price of Canadian oil. The U.S. tab for importing oil would increase as a result.

## Squo Solves Dependence

**Squo solves dependence - shift away now – multiple warrants**

**Brown 2011** (Lester, president of the Earth Policy Institute and author of World on the Edge, 10 – 6 – 11, “U.S. Gasoline Use Declining, Tar Sands Pipeline Isn't Needed”, <http://www.sustainablebusiness.com/index.cfm/go/news.display/id/22998> ck)

The US currently consumes more gasoline than the next 16 countries combined. Yes, you read that right. Among them are China, Japan, Russia, Germany, and Brazil. But now this is changing. Not only is the affluence that sustained this extravagant gasoline consumption eroding, but the automobile-centered lifestyle that was considered part of the American birthright is fading as well. U.S. gasoline use has dropped 5% in four years. Four key developments are set to **further reduce** U.S. gasoline use: a shrinking car fleet, a decline in the miles driven per car, dramatic mandated future gains in new car fuel efficiency, and the shift from gasoline to electricity to power our cars.

## Turn – Increases Dependence

**Turn – the plan increases oil dependence**

**Blackman** 3 – 12 – **12** (Sarah, reporter working across NRI Digital's websites, covering renewable energy and growth within power markets, and offshore oil drilling, “Buried in the oil sands: the value of Alberta bitumen”, <http://www.hydrocarbons-technology.com/features/featureburied-in-the-oil-sand-the-value-of-alberta-bitumen/> ck)

Developing the pipeline will also make it harder for the US to break its dependence on oil, according to Natural Resources Defense Council international director Susan Casey-Lefkowitz. In a recent blog she said: "The threat of an oil crisis if Iran blocks the Strait of Hormuz is immediate and will not be alleviated by Canadian tar sands oil. "Dependence on oil (from anywhere) is what makes us vulnerable to price spikes or supply disruptions. So the more fuel-efficient we get, the less we are beholden to foreign sources of oil - whether Iranian or Canadian. This is one of many reasons why the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is not in the national interest," Casey-Lefkowitz continued.

**US is transitioning to demand reduction now – the plan reverses this**

**Oil Change International 2012** (lobbying group for clean energy, “Keystone XL Does Not Enhance U.S. Energy Security”, <http://priceofoil.org/keystone-xl-and-energy-security/> ck)

Canadian oil and the Keystone XL pipeline only provide the illusion of energy security. They fail to substantively address any single aspect of energy security concerns. Genuine energy security is achieved through reducing the economy’s dependence on oil through demand reduction. President Obama has started the United States on the road to demand reduction through enacting vehicle efficiency standards and investing public money in technology research and development that enhances efficiency and develops alternatives to oil. There are many more things we can do to reduce demand. We can put Americans to work realizing that goal. But to bring about this change, we must reject the projects that seek to maintain the status quo by keeping America addicted to oil. Keystone XL does not enhance energy security and we should not accept its proponent’s unsubstantiated claims.

## Turn - Increases Oil Prices

**Keystone increases oil prices and fuel costs for farmers**

**Johnson 2-1**-12 (Laurie, Chief Economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council in Washington DC, former professor or economics, PhD in economics, “Keystone XL pipeline: Good forBig Oil, bad for the economy”, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone_xl_pipeline_good_for.html> ck)

By TransCanada’s own account, Keystone XL is expected to increase oil prices in the Midwest (building a pipeline to the Gulf Coast will eliminate an excess supply of the oil in the Midwest, pushing up prices). As part of its permit application to the Canadian government, TransCanada said (p.21) annual oil company revenues are expected to increase as a result by $2 to nearly $4 billion. In turn, our farmers could see an increase in fuel costs of $2.6 billion dollars or more over 2009 levels…Higher oil prices might be good for the oil industry, but they will increase the cost of living and doing business in the Midwest, negatively impacting its economy and potentially increasing unemployment.

**Turn – Increases Oil Prices in the US**

Kohn 12 (Sally Kohn, "Six reasons Keystone XL was a bad deal all along," 1/18/2012 pg online @ [**www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along///arjun**](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along///arjun))

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 creates higher gas prices**

**Alic** 7 – 4 – **12** (Jen, reporter for 24/7 Wall St, “How is the Keystone XL Pipeline Progressing?”,

<http://247wallst.com/2012/07/04/how-is-the-keystone-xl-pipeline-progressing/> ck)

In terms of economics, there is some solid research showing that Keystone XL is more likely to result in higher prices at the pump. Canadian tar sands crude pumped into the Midwest and intended for domestic gas consumption would be diverted to the Gulf Coast where it would be used in diesel production and for global exports. It could very well mean reduced gas supplies and higher gas prices in the end.

## \*\*Oil Transport/Spills\*\*

## Govt Mitigates Oil Spills

**No impact to oil spills – prevention methods and response preparation solve**

**Transport Canada** 4 – 10 – **12** (Branch of Canadian government specializing in transportation, “Oil Tanker Safety and Oil Spill Prevention”, <http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/marinesafety/menu-4100.htm> ck)

Canada has the world’s longest coastline, at more than 243,000 kilometres. Each year, 80 million tonnes of oil are shipped off Canada’s east and west coasts. On any given day, there are 180 vessels (ships known as “SOLAS vessels,” or those over 500 tonnes gross tonnage that operate internationally) operating within Canada’s Exclusive Economic Zone (200 nautical miles from shore). Transport Canada works in a number of ways to protect Canada’s waters from ships’ pollution, and to help ensure that marine transportation is safe and efficient. The Government of Canada aims to prevent spills through regulatory oversight, inspections, and enforcement measures. Transport Canada’s regulations and standards fall under the Canada Shipping Act, 2001 and the Arctic Waters Pollution Protection Act, combined with international regulations established by the International Maritime Organization (IMO). These provide the framework for the department's comprehensive marine safety inspection and enforcement programs. The Government of Canada is well prepared for and ready to respond to marine accidents from ships in Canadian waters. Ship-source oil spill prevention, preparedness, response and recovery are undertaken in a collaborative “whole-of-government” approach. Key federal departments work with private industry, as well as provincial and municipal governments, to ensure an incident is responded to in a coordinated manner.

**Government regulations and response partnerships mitigate the impact – prevents escalation of oil spills**

**Transport Canada** 4 – 10 – **12** (Branch of Canadian government specializing in transportation, “Oil Tanker Safety and Oil Spill Prevention”, <http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/marinesafety/menu-4100.htm> ck)

To ensure that Canada is prepared for and can respond to oil spills from vessels and oil handling facilities, Transport Canada works with Environment Canada, the Canadian Coast Guard, four response organizations and other agencies to respond to incidents, help reduce and eliminate pollution sources from ships in Canadian waters, and continually improve Canada’s National Oil Spill Preparedness and Response Regime. The regime sets standards for response organizations and oil handling facilities. Transport Canada sets the guidelines and regulatory structure for the preparedness for and response to marine oil spills. The department ensures that the appropriate level of preparedness is available to respond to marine oil pollution incidents in Canada of up to 10,000 tonnes within prescribed time standards and operating environments. Canada is a member of the International Maritime Organization and follows a number of international conventions to reduce pollution worldwide, including: the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), Annexes I-VI; and the 1990 International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Co-Operation (OPRC).

## Transport Safe

**They’re wrong – reviews prove oil transport to China is safe**

**CBC News** 2 – 23 – **12** (“Transport Canada OK's Northern Gateway supertankers”, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/story/2012/02/23/bc-supertanker-traffic-enbridge.html> ck)

Transport Canada has "no regulatory concerns" with Enbridge's proposed marine operations for the Northern Gateway pipeline, clearing the way for supertankers to carry Canadian crude across the Pacific. Thursday, Transport Canada told the federal Joint Review Panel examining the Enbridge Northern Gateway Project, that it had finished its review of the proposed tanker traffic that would sail through waters off B.C.'s North Coast, taking crude from the Alberta oilsands to overseas markets in China. "While there will always be residual risk in any project, after reviewing the proponent's studies and taking into account the proponent's commitments, no regulatory concerns have been identified for the vessels, vessel operations, the proposed routes, navigability, other waterway users and the marine terminal operations associated with vessels supporting the Northern Gateway Project," reads the Transport Canada review.

## \*\*Economy\*\*

## Jobs Exaggerated

**Their authors exaggerate jobs claims – there’ll be few and nonpermanent**

**Johnson 2 - 1** - 12 (Laurie, Chief Economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council in Washington DC, former professor or economics, PhD in economics, “Keystone XL pipeline: Good forBig Oil, bad for the economy”, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone_xl_pipeline_good_for.html> ck)

Interesting quote. TransCanada and its allies can’t seem to keep their numbers straight for the proposed tar sands Keystone XL pipeline. Just the day before, the company released a press statement predicting 20,000 pipeline and 118,000 “spin-off” jobs. In September of 2010, they claimed 13,000 jobs. Two months prior to that, a “study” they commissioned was released predicting 250,000 to over half a million jobs (p. 33). The Republican Party claims over 100,000. **All of these estimates contradict the statement by the company’s own Vice President**, even those at the lower end. Analysts who aren’t trying to make money off the pipeline conclude that **it would create far fewer jobs**. Researchers at Cornell University project as few as 2,500 jobs, and the State Department up to 6,000 (p.ES-22). Notably, most projections are for short-term jobs associated with construction—something proponents don’t always make clear. (There’s nothing wrong with short-term jobs, any would be welcome, but their temporary nature shouldn’t be in the fine print). According to the State Department, **as few as 20 jobs will be permanent** (p. 3.10-80) (excluding “induced” jobs created from wages spent by these workers). (Click here for a good summary explaining the differences across industry and independent analyses, by the Columbia Journalism Review).

**Their jobs claims are wildly exaggerated by the oil industry**

**Levi** **1 – 18** – 12 (Michael, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of the council’s program on energy security and climate change, “Five myths about the Keystone XL pipeline”, The Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-myths-about-the-keystone-xl-pipeline/2011/12/19/gIQApUAX8P_story_1.html> ck)

The pipeline would have created hundreds of thousands of American jobs. During the debate over the Keystone project, the oil industry rolled out a series of studies claiming that pipeline construction would create 20,000 temporary jobs in the United States and that lower oil prices (they didn’t say exactly how much lower) resulting from the new crude supplies would create as many as 250,000 more jobs across the country over the long term. These numbers were cited repeatedly by politicians who supported the pipeline. However, the first number refers to “person-years” of employment — **a single job that lasts two years is counted twice**; and in any case, **it pales compared with the overall U.S. employment challenge**. The second number is more impressive but relies on an overly optimistic estimate of how much the pipeline would have reduced global oil prices. The administration’s rejection of the pipeline will probably add less than a dollar a barrel to the long-term price of oil, hardly a decisive factor when prices are already around $100 per barrel.

**Job Counts are over-stated by TransCanada**

Kohn 12 (Sally Kohn, "Six reasons Keystone XL was a bad deal all along," 1/18/2012 pg online @ www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/01/18/six-reasons-keystone-xl-was-bad-deal-all-along///arjun)

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.

## \*\*Solvency\*\*

## Canada Can’t Do It

**Canada won’t be able to complete keystone – at best there are huge delays**

**Rosenthal** 6 – 13 – **12** (Elisabeth, reporter for New York Times, “Canada Seeks Alternatives to Transport Oil Reserves”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/14/science/earth/canada-seeks-new-ways-to-get-oil-reserves-to-market.html?_r=2> ck)

Together, the new westward pipelines would carry more oil than Keystone XL would. But even with aggressive government backing, creating new pipelines may prove as difficult in Canada as it has been in the United States, though for different reasons. Indigenous groups must be consulted if new pipelines cross their land. To gain coastal access, pipeline companies must also navigate the politics of some of the most environmentally conscious Canadian provinces, British Columbia and Quebec, where public opinion tends to be against both pipelines and further fossil fuel development. Vancouver’s City Council recently passed a motion requiring that pipeline companies take on 100 percent liability for the economic and environmental costs of a worst-case spill. Even though the federal government gives permissions for pipelines, such local maneuvering and lawsuits can cause severe delays.

## \*Tar Sans Turn\*

## Tar Sands Is Worse – Studies Prove

**Tar sands is worse – prefer the majority of studies independent of the oil industry**

**Rowell** 2 – 22 – **12** (Andy, author of Green Backlash - Global Subversion of the Environment Movement, Kretzmann is Oil Campaign Director for Project Underground, a human rights and environmental organisation in the US. “Tar Sands: “No get-out-of-jail-free card”, <http://priceofoil.org/2012/02/22/tar-sands-no-get-out-of-jail-free-card/> ck)

The tar sands is an oil versus oil argument. And in that debate, the overwhelming majority of studies independent of the oil industry show that the **tar sands are more polluting**. More importantly, it is an argument about disinvesting out of dirty oil and beginning the transition to a clean energy future that avoids dangerous climate change. Even Weaver argues that “We’re not giving a get-out-of-jail-free card to the tar-sands industry. This is not the purpose of our study.”

## Tar Sands = Emissions

**A transition to tar sands triples greenhouse pollution**

**Woynillowicz 07** (Dan, senior policy analyst with the Pembina Institute, published in World Watch Magazine, “Tar Sands Fever”, <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5287> ck)

The environmental consequences of oil production from tar sands are major, beginning with its effect on climate change. **North America's transition to** oil from the **tar sands** not only perpetuates, but **actually worsens, emissions** of greenhouse gas pollution from oil consumption. While the end products from conventional oil and tar sands are the same (mostly transportation fuels), producing a barrel of synthetic crude oil from the tar sands releases up to **three times more greenhouse gas pollution** than conventional oil. This is a result of the huge amount of energy (primarily from burning natural gas) required to generate the heat needed to extract bitumen from the tar sands and upgrade it into synthetic crude. The energy equivalent of one barrel of oil is required to produce just three barrels of oil from the tar sands.

## \*China Oil Da\*

## 1NC

**Canada is moving to do business with China now – lack of keystone is causing them to find new markets**

**Nocera** 2–6– **12** (Joe, Columnist of the New York Times, “Poisoned Politics of Keystone XL”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/07/opinion/nocera-the-poisoned-politics-of-keystone-xl.html> ck)

In Canada, the Keystone XL controversy has created a surprising new resolve. “Keystone was a transformative turning point in terms of how Harper sees the bilateral relationship,” says Fen Hampson, a professor of international affairs at Carleton University in Ottawa. Instead of blithely assuming the United States would purchase its oil, Canada is now determined to find diverse buyers so it won’t be held hostage by American politics. Hence, the newfound willingness to do business with China. Canada has concluded that it simply can’t expect much from the United States, even on an issue that would seem to be vital to our own interests.

**Tar sands trade to China is key to reducing emissions – coal burning is net worse and demand for energy is rapidly growing**

**Hwo** 3 – 5 – **12** (Winnie, Climate Change and Clean Energy Campaigner with the David Suzuki Foundation, quoting Dr. Wenran Jiang - Chair at the University of Alberta, a senior adviser to the Alberta government and a frequent contributor to the Financial Post and CBC “Should Canada sell its tar sands oil to China? It is a decision Canadians need to make”, <http://www.davidsuzuki.org/blogs/climate-blog/2012/03/should-canada-sell-its-tar-sands-oil-to-china-it-is-a-decision-canadians-need-to/> ck)

Will selling tar sands oil to China help that country reduce its greenhouse gas emissions? Dr. Wenran Jiang argues it will. In a talk at UBC titled "Putting Environment into the Canada-China Energy Equation", Dr. Jiang said China burns lots of coal and burning coal creates high levels of greenhouse gas emissions. If Canada sells more tar sands bitumen to China, he said, we can help China lower its GHG emissions because burning oil creates fewer emissions than burning coal. Dr. Jiang — who is the MacTaggart Chair at the University of Alberta, a senior adviser to the Alberta government and a frequent contributor to the Financial Post and CBC — gave his 90-minute presentation as the first of the China in Global Perspective: The Energy-Sustainability Nexus series hosted by the Institute of Asian Research, with Carbon Talks, the Pacific Institute for Climate Solutions and the Liu Centre for Global Issues. Since 2006, China has surpassed the U.S. as the world's top overall greenhouse gas emitter. Although China's current per capita GHG emissions are 6.8 tonnes per year, lower than the U.S.'s 16.9 tonnes and Canada's 16.15 tonnes a year, at the existing rate of industrial and domestic growth in China, per capita GHG emissions could surpass those of the U.S. by 2017. Xie Zhenhua, vice chair of China's National Development and Reform Commission, said last year that this is not an option. China's GHG emissions and addiction to coal need to be reined in. China gets 70 per cent of its energy from coal, and nine per cent from renewable sources including wind, solar, hydro and nuclear. Four per cent is from natural gas and 15 per cent from petroleum, mainly from Africa and the Middle East. As a Chinese Canadian, I may be expected to cheer for a plan that seemingly helps our economy while lowering China's GHG emissions. But I don't! According to Dr. Jiang's presentation, China's "explosive" industrial growth, the expansion of the middle class and increasing urbanization will force an ever-expanding demand for fossil fuels. However, China's main fossil fuel — coal — will lead to even more environmental degradation and GHG emissions. Dr. Jiang said China is now the largest auto consumer in the world, that 70 per cent of China's water is polluted, that 90 per cent of global electronic waste is dumped in southern China, not to mention the burning of coal and other fossil fuels in China which made up 90 per cent of China's fuel source. Beijing has become the poster boy for poor air quality capitals of the world. The total sum of China's pollution, according to Dr. Jiang, is costing the Chinese economy $200 billion US a year. To enhance energy security, Dr. Jiang said, China should buy Canadian oil, because 80 per cent of China's petroleum is currently imported from politically and socially unstable countries in Africa, the Middle East and South America. Dr. Jiang emphasized that China spends $230 billion a year on overall foreign purchases and is expected to spend $500 billion by 2015. Selling Alberta tar sands bitumen to China would allow Canada to take advantage of this vast investment opportunity. But the argument is flawed.

**Coal emissions comparatively increase warming more than tar sands – studies prove**

**Huffington Post** 2 – 20 – **12** (quotes Andrew Weaver and Neil Swart – expert climate scientists - lead author on two reports from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “Climate Change: Coal, Not Oilsands The Real Bad Guy Says Study”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2012/02/19/coal-oilsands-climate-change_n_1287693.html> ck)

One of the world's top climate scientists has calculated that emissions from Alberta's oilsands are unlikely to make a big difference to global warming and that the real threat to the planet comes from burning coal. "I was surprised by the results of our analysis," said Andrew Weaver, a University of Victoria climate modeller, who has been a lead author on two reports from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. "I thought it was larger than it was." In a commentary published Sunday in the prestigious journal Nature, Weaver and colleague Neil Swart analyze how burning all global stocks of coal, oil and natural gas would affect temperatures. Their analysis breaks out unconventional gas, such as undersea methane hydrates and shale gas produced by fracking, as well as unconventional oil sources including the oilsands. They found that if all the hydrocarbons in the oilsands were mined and consumed, the carbon dioxide released would raise global temperatures by about .36 degrees C. That's about half the total amount of warming over the last century. When only commercially viable oilsands deposits are considered, the temperature increase is only .03 degrees C. In contrast, the paper concludes that burning all the globe's vast coal deposits would create a 15-degree increase in temperature. Burning all the abundant natural gas would warm the planet by more than three degrees. Governments around the world have agreed to try to keep warming to two degrees.

**Warming = extinction**

## Uniqueness

**Canada is opening oil sales to Asia in light of US keystone refusal**

**Korbe** 4 – 3 – **12** (Tina, reporter for news site Hot Air, “Harper: Thanks to Obama’s “no” on Keystone, the price of Canadian crude will go up for the U.S.”, <http://hotair.com/archives/2012/04/03/harper-thanks-to-obamas-no-on-keystone-the-price-of-canadian-crude-will-go-up-for-the-u-s/> ck)

The damage is done. Even if President Barack Obama decides to approve the Keystone XL pipeline at some point in the future, he already sent a message to Canada that our northern neighbor can’t rely on us as its only energy customer — and Canadian prime minister Stephen Harper heeded it. In an interview with former U.S. Rep. Jane Harman (D-Calif.) in D.C. yesterday, Harper explained that Canada will now seek to expand its export market to Asia and will also cease to supply oil to the United States at a discounted rate. “Look, the very fact that a ‘no’ could even be said underscores to our country that we must diversify our energy export markets,” Harper told Harman in front of a live audience of businesspeople, scholars, diplomats, and journalists. … Harper also told Harman that Canada has been selling its oil to the United States at a discounted price. So not only will America be able to buy less Canadian oil even if Keystone is eventually approved, the U.S. will also have to pay more for it because the market for oilsands crude will be more competitive. “We have taken a significant price hit by virtue of the fact that we are a captive supplier and that just does not make sense in terms of the broader interests of the Canadian economy,” Harper said. “We’re still going to be a major supplier of the United States. It will be a long time, if ever, before the United States isn’t our number one export market, but for us the United States cannot be our only export market. “That is not in our interest, either commercially or in terms of pricing.” “We cannot be, as a country, in a situation where our one and, in many cases, only energy partner could say no to our energy products. We just cannot be in that position.”

## Emissions I/L

**China’s coal dependency will only increase – it creates massive emissions and toxic clouds**

**Kage** 20**07** (Ben, reporter for Natural News, “Coal emissions blanket China with pollution”, <http://www.naturalnews.com/021386.html> ck)

China is enjoying dynamic growth of late, but the coal-fired economic boom has severe environmental consequences, including massive toxic clouds visible even from space. The great coal rush in China -- brought on by its voracious power needs -- is the biggest since the 19th century. Coal seems the natural answer as oil is considered too expensive at $60 a barrel, and alternative power sources such as hydroelectric power and wind power compensate for only a fraction of the country's demand. China currently has more than 21,000 coalmines in operation, and around 2,000 coal-fired power stations, with plans to build at least 500 more. Zeng Peiyan, a vice-premier for the nation, said that coal output had doubled in the last five years, and experts predict that the country will burn 2.5 billion tons of the material this year. The great boons from this growth have come at a terrible cost, however. Most of the coal-fired power stations in operation are not modernized and emit large amounts of smoke, carbon dioxide and sulfur into the atmosphere. The toxic clouds kicked up from coal mining and burning activities are big enough to be seen from space, and have drifted to faraway locations such as California. These clouds contain microscopic chemical particles known to cause cancer, heart and lung conditions. China itself is suffering immediate effects as well. Smoking is already popular among the populace, and cancer rates are climbing rapidly thanks to the pollution, which is thought to cause roughly 400,000 premature deaths annually.

## Coal Key

**Addressing coal consumption is critical to humanity’s survivability**

**Weaver** 2 – 21 **– 12** (Andrew, Professor and Canada Research Chair, “Our New Study: Global Warming From Coal Worse than Oil Sands”,

<http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/andrew-weaver/eu-law-oil-canada_b_1288264.html> ck)

In other words: Coal presents a climate challenge that is much greater than that presented by the oil sands. Our overarching conclusion is that as a society, we will live or die by our future consumption of coal. The idea that we're going to somehow run out of coal, natural gas, and other fossil fuels is misplaced. We'll run out of our ability to live on the planet long before we run out of them. Some might point out that our published calculations do not account for the additional greenhouse gases arising from the extraction, transportation, and refining of the tar sand resource. This was deliberate. The so-called "wells-to-wheels" approach to tar-sands mining includes the natural gas, diesel, and coal emissions that arise during extraction and refining, together with the transportation of the oil. However, these would come from the other resource pools and shouldn't be double-counted. The relative mix of such fuels would obviously change in the future as well. We wanted to be consistent to ensure that emissions and subsequent warming from all resources were calculated the same way.

**Coal emissions comparatively increase warming more than tar sands – studies prove**

**Huffington Post** 2 – 20 – **12** (quotes Andrew Weaver and Neil Swart – expert climate scientists - lead author on two reports from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “Climate Change: Coal, Not Oilsands The Real Bad Guy Says Study”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2012/02/19/coal-oilsands-climate-change_n_1287693.html> ck)

One of the world's top climate scientists has calculated that emissions from Alberta's oilsands are unlikely to make a big difference to global warming and that the real threat to the planet comes from burning coal. "I was surprised by the results of our analysis," said Andrew Weaver, a University of Victoria climate modeller, who has been a lead author on two reports from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. "I thought it was larger than it was." In a commentary published Sunday in the prestigious journal Nature, Weaver and colleague Neil Swart analyze how burning all global stocks of coal, oil and natural gas would affect temperatures. Their analysis breaks out unconventional gas, such as undersea methane hydrates and shale gas produced by fracking, as well as unconventional oil sources including the oilsands. They found that if all the hydrocarbons in the oilsands were mined and consumed, the carbon dioxide released would raise global temperatures by about .36 degrees C. That's about half the total amount of warming over the last century. When only commercially viable oilsands deposits are considered, the temperature increase is only .03 degrees C. In contrast, the paper concludes that burning all the globe's vast coal deposits would create a 15-degree increase in temperature. Burning all the abundant natural gas would warm the planet by more than three degrees. Governments around the world have agreed to try to keep warming to two degrees.

## Transition Key

**Transition away from coal to oilsands is key to solve warming**

**Huffington Post** 2 – 20 – **12** (quotes Andrew Weaver and Neil Swart – expert climate scientists - lead author on two reports from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “Climate Change: Coal, Not Oilsands The Real Bad Guy Says Study”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2012/02/19/coal-oilsands-climate-change_n_1287693.html> ck)

"The conventional and unconventional oil is not the problem with global warming," Weaver said. "The problem is coal and unconventional natural gas." He said his analysis suggests **it is an increased dependence on coal — not the oilsands — that governments have to worry about**. As well, there's so much gas in the world that it will also cause problems despite the fact it emits less carbon than oil. "One might argue that the best strategy one might take is to use our oil reserves wisely, but at the same time use them in a way that weans us of our dependence on coal and natural gas," Weaver said. "As we become more and more dependent on these massive reserves, we're less and less likely to wean ourselves away from them."

## China Key

**China is key – must act now to reduce coal emissions**

**Bloomberg** 20**12** (Bloomberg News and Markets Magazine, Quoted: Kelly Sims Gallagher, associate professor of Energy and Environmental Policy at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, Energy Technology Innovation Policy research group senior associate, and member of the Belfer Center Board of Directors, “China Beats U.S. With Power From Coal Processing”, 3 – 3 – 12, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-03-27/china-beats-u-s-with-power-from-coal-processing-trapping-carbon.html> ck)

Scientists say China must act now. The world has just two or three decades to avoid irreversible climate change, says Kelly Sims Gallagher, an energy professor at Tufts University in Medford, Massachusetts, and author of two books on pollution. “If the Chinese don’t dramatically reduce carbon emissions from coal, there’s no way we can make a dent in climate change globally in the time period that matters,” Gallagher says. David Fridley, at the U.S. Department of Energy’s Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, says it may already be too late to avert higher temperatures, rising seas and melting glaciers. He says China’s emissions won’t stop increasing until its population peaks at 1.45 billion in 2030 -- that’s 15 years after he predicts immutable global warming. “If global emissions don’t start declining after 2015, all we can do is adapt to a world that will be highly disrupted,” he says.

**China carbon reduction is key to prevent tipping the threshold**

**Hallding et al 09** (Karl Hallding, Guoyi Han, Marie Olsson, commission on sustainable development, “A Balancing Act: China’s Role in Climate Change”, February 2009, <http://www.sei-international.org/mediamanager/documents/Publications/china-cluster/chinacluster_abalancingact.pdf> ck)

China is crucial for success in keeping global warming within the 2°C bracket. As one of the most carbon intensive economies in the world China’s low-cost mitigation potentials are extensive, but fully realising those potentials requires transformative changes. A giant leap is required to move from the so-called reference or baseline scenarios to the level of emission reduction that is in line with reaching a global 2°C target. Yet to reach the reference or baseline scenarios already assumes a “grand achievement” of China’s national ambition, which is far from certain and requires further sharpening of policies and effectiveness in their implementation. (See Figure 1) China’s emissions would have to peak around 2020 to keep the world on track towards a 2°C target. The most ambitious vision from the Chinese economist Hu Angang argues that the peak should occur by 2020 and no later than 2030, and that by 2050 China should be able to cut its emissions by 50 percent compared to 1990 levels. Calculations for China using the Greenhouse Development Rights approach 2 indicate that the global share of emissions from China would have to peak at about eight GtCO2 by 2015 and decrease to just over four by 2030 if global warming were to be kept within a 2°C bracket. Out of this China’s own responsibility would amount to seven GtCO2 while the remaining three would be subject to international responsibility

**China is critical to addressing climate change**

**Hallding et al 09** (Karl Hallding, Guoyi Han, Marie Olsson, commission on sustainable development, “A Balancing Act: China’s Role in Climate Change”, February 2009, <http://www.sei-international.org/mediamanager/documents/Publications/china-cluster/chinacluster_abalancingact.pdf> ck)

The consequences of China standing outside the global process would be dire. It would signal that China does not take the climate threat seriously, and would thwart the world’s chances to solve the climate crisis**.** Without China as an active partner in a global climate compact the potential for global low-carbon economic development would also be reduced, particularly if the threats of carbon related border tax adjustments were to become a reality, or if China were hindered in its export of affordable low-carbon products to OECD markets. China’s ability and willingness to slow the growth of its carbon emissions, reaching a point within the coming couple of decades where total emissions start declining, is **crucial for the success of a global effort to come to grips with the climate crisis**. It is imperative, therefore, that the international community reaches a deeper understanding of the role that climate and energy security play in China’s development and emergence as a global economic, political and cultural power.

## Warming Impact – Power plants

**Warming causes power plants to shut down**

**Koch** 5 – 6 – **12** (Wendy, USA today reporter, “Climate change causes nuclear, coal plant shutdowns”, <http://content.usatoday.com/communities/greenhouse/post/2012/06/climate-change-makes-nuclear-coal-power-plants-vulnerable/1> ck)

Climate change, by warming water and reducing river flows, has caused production losses at several nuclear and coal-fired power plants in the United States and Europe in recent years and will lead to more power disruptions in the future, researchers report. The Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant in Alabama, for example, had to shut down more than once last summer because the Tennessee River's water was too warm to use it for cooling. The likelihood of extreme drops in power generation from total or partial plant shutdowns will triple in the next 50 years, according to a study published this week in Nature Climate Change. "This study suggests that our reliance on thermal cooling is something that we're going to have to revisit," co-author Dennis Lettenmaier, a University of Washington professor of civil and environmental engineering, said in announcing the findings. Power from thermoelectric plants, which provide more than 90% of electricity in the U.S. and three-quarters in Europe, will decrease 4% to 16% in the U.S. and 6% to 19% in Europe due to lack of cooling water between 2031 and 2060, the authors project. These plants use nuclear or fossil fuels to heat water into steam that turns a turbine. While much of this water is "recycled," they rely on consistent volumes of water, at a particular temperature, to prevent the turbines from overheating.

## AT: Alt Energy Solves

**Alternate forms of energy can’t solve – benefits are wiped out by coal consumption**

**Watts** 1 – 12 - **12** (Jonathan, Guardian’s Asia environment correspondent, “China's renewables surge dampened by growth in coal consumption”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/jan/12/china-renewable-energy-coal-consumption> ck)

China tripled its solar energy generating capacity last year and notched up major increases in wind and hydropower, government figures showed this week, but officials are still struggling to cap the growth in coal burning, which is the **biggest source of carbon dioxide emissions in the world**. The latest evidence of China's promotion of renewable energy has been welcomed by climate activists, but they warn that **the benefits are being wiped out by the surge in coal consumption**. After burning an extra 95m tonnes last year, China will soon account for half the coal burned on the planet. This has alarmed state planners concerned about the impact of air pollution and climate change, but their efforts to cap the nation's energy consumption are said to have run into resistance from local governments who fear restrictions on economic growth.

## AT: Empirically Denied/Cooling Now

**Sulfur has shielded coal burning effects but sulfur scrubbing mean we’re on the brink**

**Schmid 2011** (Randolph, AP science writer, reporter of the Huffington Post, “China Coal Consumption Linked To Global Cooling”, 7 – 5 – 11, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/04/global-warming-china-air-pollution_n_889897.html> ck)

WASHINGTON -- Scientists have come up with a possible explanation for why the rise in Earth's temperature paused for a bit during the 2000s, one of the hottest decades on record. The answer seems counterintuitive. It's all that sulfur pollution in the air from China's massive coal-burning, according to a new study. Sulfur particles in the air deflect the sun's rays and can temporarily cool things down a bit. That can happen even as coal-burning produces the carbon dioxide that contributes to global warming. "People normally just focus on the warming effect of CO2 (carbon dioxide), but during the Chinese economic expansion there was a huge increase in sulfur emissions," which have a cooling effect, explained Robert K. Kaufmann of Boston University. He's the lead author of the study published Monday in Proceedings of the National Academy of Science. But sulfur's cooling effect is only temporary, while the carbon dioxide from coal burning stays in Earth's atmosphere a long time. Chinese coal consumption doubled between 2003 and 2007, and that caused a 26 percent increase in global coal consumption, Kaufmann said. Now, Chinese leaders have recognized the effects of that pollution on their environment and their citizens' health and are installing equipment to scrub out the sulfur particles, Kaufmann said. Sulfur quickly drops out of the air if it is not replenished, while carbon dioxide remains for a long time, so its warming effects are beginning to be visible again, he noted. The plateau in temperature growth disappeared in 2009 and 2010, when temperatures lurched upward.

## AT: Sulfur Solves Warming

**Any reduction in warming from sulfur is overwhelmed by carbon dioxide emissions**

**Kage** 20**07** (Ben, reporter for Natural News, “Coal emissions blanket China with pollution”, <http://www.naturalnews.com/021386.html> ck)

The strange result of China's pollution is that some of it may actually be slowing global warming, according to some scientists. They say the sulfur dioxide emissions are so huge that particles are actually reflecting sunlight back into space, although the researchers also noted that the effect would eventually be **overwhelmed by the country's carbon dioxide outpu**t.

## AT: Temperatures Fluctuate

**Our evidence assumes their cooling claims – warming is masked by periods of sulfur production**

**Schmid 2011** (Randolph, AP science writer, reporter of the Huffington Post, “China Coal Consumption Linked To Global Cooling”, 7 – 5 – 11, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/04/global-warming-china-air-pollution_n_889897.html> ck)

Overall, global temperatures have been increasing for more than a century since the industrial revolution began adding gases like carbon dioxide to the air. But there have been similar plateaus, such as during the post-World War II era when industrial production boosted sulfur emissions in several parts of the world, Kaufmann explained. Atmospheric scientists and environmentalists are concerned that continued rising temperatures could have serious impacts worldwide, ranging from drought in some areas, changes in storm patterns, spread of tropical diseases and rising sea levels.

## AT: US Cuts in Emissions Solve

**US action not enough – China emission reduction is key**

**Taylor** 1 – 25 – **12** (James, contributor to Forbes, “New Emissions Data Dampen Global Warming Fears”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2012/01/25/new-emissions-data-dampen-global-warming-fears/> ck)

Moreover, U.S. emissions restrictions would have no real-world climate impact. China alone emits more carbon dioxide than the entire Western Hemisphere combined. Chinese emissions are rising at a pace of roughly 10% per year and have more than doubled since 2000. China alone is responsible for 75% of the growth in global emissions since 2000. Even if the United States completely and immediately eliminated all carbon dioxide emissions, in less than a decade **China would add more new emissions than what the** **U**nited **S**tates **eliminated**. Importantly, China has insisted over and over again that it will not accept carbon dioxide restrictions regardless of what the United States and the rest of the world does.

## AT: US Needs o/w China

**The US doesn’t need the oil and Canada will sell it to China**

**Walker** 1 – 18 – **12** (Bill, writer and columnist for Climate Central and a former newspaper correspondent. For more than 20 years, he was a communications strategist for leading environmental organizations, “Decision by Obama Won’t Keep Oil from Flowing”, <http://www.climatecentral.org/blogs/obamas-rejection-of-keystone-xl-itself-wont-keep-tar-sands-oil-out-of-the-u/> ck)

The fact is that the U.S. doesn’t need tar sands oil. Fuel consumption is flat and will continue to decline as cars become more fuel-efficient. At the same time, domestic oil production is reaching historic highs. It just doesn’t make sense for TransCanada to invest $7 billion in a pipeline to supply a declining market. Tar sands oil production is projected to double by 2020, so the Canadian oil industry desperately needs access to growth markets. To try to push the U.S. into permitting the pipeline, the Canadian government has threatened to play the China card. If Keystone is rejected, they say, they’ll simply sell the oil to fuel-thirsty China. Another Canadian company, Enbridge Energy, wants to build the Northern Gateway pipeline to carry tar sands oil to the West Coast for export to China and other Asian markets. That pipeline wouldn’t cross American soil, so U.S. approval is not needed.