| * **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 |
| --- | --- |
| * **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   + Tax cuts * 2 Tax cuts help individuals to **save** * Impact of saving money * **CG/GW 74** * A world: people can’t afford food, shelter, transportation, etc * Main clash: how to help people more   + CONCLUSION: IMMEDIATE assistance * POI: short-term or long-term? * Refutation for OO:   + OO ignored that people are not making ends meet | * **CO/OM 77** * Differing from OO:   + lower taxes for people in the lowest income bracket   + Infrastructure *forces* people to find a job * 1 Give people more money   + POI: tax reduction, economic benefits   + **It doesn’t create production**. => inflation * 2 Infrastructure improves trade   + Bridges, railroads, air, etc * 3 Circular loop of money   + 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 * **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   + E.g., Bridges   + Western Liberal Democracies: *emergency room for free?* * Hospital subsidization is in fact infrastructure * Don’t have a car. Makes buses cheaper * Low-income   + 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 |