

National Affairs by Claire Hoy ? The real definition of ?liberal?

Earlier this month, when the Republicans capitalized on the growing distaste for Barack Obama's flailing presidency, taking control of the Senate (and adding to their majority in Congress), much of this country's mainstream ? overwhelmingly small ? liberal ? media tut-tutted that this was a terrible development for Canada.

The Globe and Mail, for example, headlined the mid-term election results with: ?White House faces paralysis as Republicans take the Senate.?

And the Globe's veteran Ottawa columnist Jeffrey Simpson's column was headlined :?Republicans win, but America suffers.? He went on to write that the U.S. ?is stuck in gridlock even more intractable than it was before. The Republicans gained; Barack Obama lost; the whole country suffers.?

Ah yes, if only Americans were as smart as Simpson and his fellow Globites, they surely would have known better than to vote for those nasty Republicans. But, alas, such voter intelligence. it seems, is just too much to hope for.

Indeed, this snobbish view of the voters is clearly shared by liberals everywhere, as we learned last week when videos of MIT economics professor Johnathan Gruber emerged, showing the architect of Obama's much-despised Obamacare plan was predicated on the ?stupidity? of the general populace. Had they actually understood what they were in for ? and that most of the so-called benefits were based on flat-out lies (e.g. ?If you want to keep your physician you can,? said Obama, knowing you can't), they would have recoiled in horror. But then, as then Democratic House Leader Nancy Pelosi infamously explained at the time, ?we have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it, away from the fog of controversy.?

This addiction to serial lying having been publicly exposed over and over again ? and, for the most part, simply ignored by the pro-Obama media ? apparently continues unabated despite the mid-term election results, no doubt based on the theory ? perpetuated by the eggheads at the Globe and elsewhere ? that people who don't support Obama are a)- stupid, b)- racist and c)- both.

And so when liberals complain that the election results will lead to ?paralysis? at the White House, they conveniently ignore the fact that the Senate has held a Democratic majority during Obama's reign yet Senate Democratic Leader Harry Reid, doing Obama's bidding, consistently refused to even allow contentious bills to reach the Senate floor for a debate.

And the one most relevant for Canada ? and the reason why Republican majorities would be better for us ? is the bogged-down dispute over the controversial Keystone Pipeline, a project designed to pump some 700,000 barrels of Alberta bitumen a day to U.S. refineries, a project which the well-financed Big Environment groups, who have captured Obama's ear with their blatant misrepresentation of the project, have so far managed to keep on hold despite the obvious benefits to both the U.S. and Canada in terms of jobs, economic activity and yes, environmental upgrades.

It's not as if oil products aren't already being shipped south. They are. But much of that is going by rail, a far more risky proposal than Keystone could ever be. And, despite all the ongoing claims to the contrary ? and the hysterical ravings of Neil Young and David Suzuki about the end of our world as we know it ? the non-partisan U.S. State Department concluded after a thorough study of the project that it will not lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions. Period. Full stop.

Ah yes, but that's not what liberals want to hear. Reacting to an overwhelming vote in favor of the project in Congress last week ? the ninth time Congress has done that (only to be blocked by the Senate antics of Reid) ? Liz Heyd, a spokeswoman for the National Resources Defense Council, said it is a ?plan to pipe some of the dirtiest oil on the planet through the breadbasket of America to be refined on the Gulf Coast to fuels that can be mostly shipped overseas.?

Obama himself picked up the theme, claiming Keystone would mostly benefit Canada, not the U.S., and saying it would mostly be shipped overseas anyway from Gulf Coast refineries.

Both conveniently ignore the above-mentioned State Department findings that it will not contribute to greenhouse gases and is safer ? and cheaper ? than other sources of oil.

And surely it's better for the U.S. to rely on Canadian products as opposed to, oh, Saudia Arabia or Iran, for example. What's more, it's not true that most of it will be refined in Texas and then shipped abroad. Some will. But more will service growing American needs.

But then, why get bogged down with actual facts. Much better to react to these things by perpetuating a public fraud and maligning anybody stupid enough to disagree.

That's the real definition of a liberal.

