

- **OG/PM 75**

- TH: not definition
- Microloans, cash transfer
- Urban-underde2 economy, stimulate the economy

- **OG/DPM 73**

- POI: CO: Africa? Debt? Like the USA?
- People can't afford to stay in those houses etc
 - People are stuck in debt
 - People need money right away
 - Pay off interests
- Too extreme a characterization

- **OO/LO 75**

- Have to give more and more money
- They're thinking about how to survive
- **POI: CO: they just need more advanced infrastructure**
- 1 Infrastructure benefits all people
 - More people working etc
- Refutation
 - 1 Immediate relief
 - Should invest
 - 2 Injecting cash, stimulate
 - Actually stimulated more by infra

- **OO/DLO 75**

- Where is this set?
- Debt?
- Get more jobs from infrastructure projects
 - Economic depression, Roosevelt
 - Two impacts
 - Infrastructure will transfer jobs to China
 - More economic growth
 - More stimulation: money going into
- Weighing
 - Long-term supply of money
 - Public infrastructure

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CG/GM 75 ● Infrastructure doesn't help, if you don't have a car, e.g. ● Extreme cases from the opening half: don't have water ● Too whip-esque ● POI: Coco-cola? ● 1 They can't save money in the first place, taxes..., even with the infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tax cuts ● 2 Tax cuts help individuals to save ● Impact of saving money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CG/GW 74 ● A world: people can't afford food, shelter, transportation, etc ● Main clash: how to help people more <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CONCLUSION: IMMEDIATE assistance ● POI: short-term or long-term? ● Refutation for OO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ OO ignored that people are not making ends meet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CO/OM 77 ● Differing from OO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ lower taxes for people in the lowest income bracket ○ Infrastructure <i>forces</i> people to find a job ● 1 Give people more money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ POI: tax reduction, economic benefits ○ It doesn't create production. => inflation ● 2 Infrastructure improves trade <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bridges, railroads, air, etc ● 3 Circular loop of money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Give the taxes collected from poor people back to the poor people ● Conclusion: loop of inflation, no more development ● With a quote: give people skills not handouts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CO/OW 76 ● Benefits of infrastructure, you have to pay up ● CG mistakenly says people need to make ends meet. CO: infrastructure makes people richer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g., Bridges ○ Western Liberal Democracies: <i>emergency room for free?</i> ● Hospital subsidization is in fact infrastructure ● Don't have a car. Makes buses cheaper ● Low-income <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 Not enough money to make a difference ○ 2 can't survive long run on stimulus checks
---	---

Debate 5

THP punishments to carbon-intensive behaviours
(e.g. fines) as opposed to incentives for green
technology transitions (e.g. subsidies for the
development of green tech)

OO > CG > OG > CO

- **OG/PM Zoey lost 72**

- Florida
 - Hurricane, leaving families etc
 - Model
 - House: Canada
 - Co2
 - Incentives, *partial* transition
 - Punishment: *proportional, less carbon tax*
 - Use of fine: to improve environment
 - 1 Climate change **is a problem. Hard to predict the climate. Unordinary**
 - Natural cycle cycle. E.g, Hurricane Milton. Canada heat waves
 - Housing not with A/C built in
 - Alberta has snow late
 - 2 Green technology
 - Transition to green energy
 - **Take something away is more powerful**
 - Incentives not completely working.
 - Impact:
 - 2 Green technology
 - More flexible range. More motivated to *fully transition*

- **OG/DPM Ashley 74**

- 1 Refutation of OO
 - OO says Too expensive to fund these companies. Companies are already not green. And they're broke.
 - OG: we're taking money from the people. They are **responsible** for it.
 - OO says it hurts the economy. It's **unethical**. Taking from the people.
 - OO says not rich enough.
 - OG: climate change not refuted
- 2 Recon
- 3 Bare reinvestment
 - Reinvesting the money
 - Transitioning is consistent?
 - Punishment reinvested in climate change initiatives.
 - Ethically: polluters are now making a **positive contribution**
- Impact: we're fair, ethical. Stable side, consistent

- **OO/LO Ben spoke too fast, breathing.**

- **Good labeling 78**

- Refutation line-by-line
 - 1 Fiat not necessarily going to research
 - 2 *too fast*
- Two very long cases
- 1 Companies are already not green
 - Why we get more transition more?
 - Less motivation because: it costs too much. Profit incentive
 - Companies need to have make money
 - Greenwashing. Don't want to miss out on the opportunity to transition
 - Comparative
 - OG punishment: e.g., oil, gas, *hurts everyone*
 - Oil prices up. Consumers. Profit is less. **They can't do it by themselves?**
 - Pay more and more, less able to go green. Going green costs money.
- 2 Economy
 - Can't afford workers. Vulnerable people farmers oil workers etc

- **OO/DLO Adam 76**

- Refutation:
 - OG didn't recognize: companies can't afford it in the long run. Profit basis
- 1 Environmental clash 4 min
 - Harder to make money. Harder to transition
 - POI from OG: unethical to take money from ordinary people **under mechanized**
 - Government won't spend money on environments in the first place
 - Political backlash: people hate bad economy
 - Political polarization? Poilievre or Green
 - Government can't afford
 - **POI OG: punishment creates negative PR. incentive**
 - Average person doesn't care. Oil companies are not gonna stop
- 2 Economic clash
 - OG only says unethical. Not mechanized
 - Under OG: Marginalized people have to pay more for solar panels.

- **CG/GM Wilson 74**

- CG will clean it up
- Cyclical effect.
- 1 Front half:
 - OO has profit motif. OO says it'll cripple the economy. OO abused fiat.
 - *Root issues of polluting*
 - *Inconvenient*
 - *Unprofitable*
 - People follow the government on the perception
 - A. PR image for the environment
 - Testament on commitment for the government. As if breaking the law
 - POI OO: changing social norms?
- 2 Transitioning is one-and-done
 - No prioritization
 - One and done. Temporary

- **CG/GW Kalan 77**

- Perception is the most important
- Against OG
 - Moral accountability
 - One-and-done, public perception just another *normal problem*. It's not healthcare
 - Feel morally responsible when *looking* like a crime.
- Against OO
 - POI: people have their personal opinions. This changes the norms
 - OO assumes that the subsidy is consistent. But it's **one-and-done**
 - Companies won't change. They are incentivized to solve the problem
- Against CO

- **CO/OM Jerry 73**

- CO focuses on **individual impact**
- 1 DPM: money comes from the people
 - Already taking in from the people
- 2 CG: public perception
 - Works against them. Getting into second argument
- 1 Fines not incentives
 - Fines don't really do much
 - When fines damage the companies, they **lobby against the government**, etc, etc
 - POI: Why will billion-dollar oil company care about a bit of fine?
 - Fine doesn't work
 - If it does, companies lobby against
- 2 Also applicable to farmers. Can't fine a farmer. Farmers can't transition because of lack of money
- Cotention
- Put them in a hard place. Categorization

- **CO/OW Ethan 72**

- Most important clash: how to improve the environment?
 - Companies, abundance and reliance on the money, etc, etc
 - POI CG: gaslighting the panel
- CO OM tells why fines don't work
 - Billion-worth companies don't feel it
 - This just doesn't work
 - Moral accountability doesn't work
- Government says, fines increase moral accountability which doesn't work
- Government says fines don't speed up green transition which doesn't work.
 - Fines effect is marginal
 - Moral accountability doesn't work
- CO