

stature?

A: Our argument is that it is beneficial; the parents can realize that as well. It is not a sequitor as to whether it is true. Our argument on the education debate specifically indicates that this \$500 they receive will be good for them going to college.

Q: They receive \$500? College tuition for one year at an average college is drastically more than \$500. I am wondering why the economic stimulus of this summer is that necessary when kids have four years in the future they can get a job.

A: The first piece of Sagawa evidence is empirical and on point on this argument; it indicates that this \$500 at a key time in which families aren't even really starting to think about it yet gets them along that track and gets them to acquire more scholarships.

Q: So the economic benefits derived from the plan would occur not only four years for high school, but then four years for college, and then after that these individuals would be in the labor force, correct?

A: Uh, we're claiming that this immediacy of the plan leads to a perception that these people are now getting into college; it makes them college bound.

Q: There is a perception that college enlistment numbers go up even though they will not actually go up for four more years. Which piece of evidence draws that distinction? Please point it out specifically.

A: These children are immediately serving. Our Sagawa evidence in the civil society ...

Q: Could you please point it out specifically? That's all I'm asking.

A: You got it. On the civil society advantage, our evidence from Sagawa evidence indicates that these people will be serving immediately, thus increasing the community's feeling towards what they can and cannot do.

Q: So the U.S. economy is dependent on a \$500 stipend being given to eighth graders?

A: No, the U.S. economy is dependent on cultural diversity in our educational systems.

Q: So we need to be critical thinkers and engage more students?

A: Uh, that's kind of our argument. It's specific students that we're looking for.

FIRST NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE SPEECH BY STEPHANIE SPIES (GLENBROOK NORTH HIGH SCHOOL)

Before I start, there are a few people that we would like to thank. I would like to thank the National Forensic League for hosting this tournament. Vickie Fellers, the Wichita host committee, the generous tournament sponsors, and especially the Colorado College for hosting policy debate as an event at this tournament. And the tab room at Wichita East for putting on such a well-run and fun tournament. Thank you to the esteemed panel of judges for taking your time to adjudicate this important debate. I would also like to