

AmeriCorps which is only for the summer. Additionally, our Sagawa evidence indicates that these underprivileged youth would not be doing it during the year—that they are specifically looking for something to do during their summer.

She says that we just make it a job, but we give them a \$500 scholarship. Our Sagawa evidence at the top of the education advantage specifically says that this \$500 scholarship brands these youth as college potential, something that neither they or their parents would have considered before. It puts them on the path to college. They don't see it as a job, but as an opportunity. Additionally, extend our last piece of Sagawa evidence on solvency which says that these youth are too young to have jobs during the summer anyway.

And finally, she says that interest in AmeriCorps is high, but extend the first piece of Sagawa evidence in inherency which says that underprivileged youth are not civically engaged, and they are certainly not civically engaged in AmeriCorps.

On to her justification argument. First, she has no evidence indicating that we are going to be able to get underprivileged people within the debate realm. Additionally, we solve this civic engagement with our 1AC. We say that teenagers aren't civically engaged right now and underprivileged children aren't civically engaged. If we civically engage them the summer before their freshman year in high school, then once they are in their freshman year they will be more likely to take activities like debate because they will be interested in public issues.

Additionally, we don't need to justify that we are the only way to solve our advantages. We just need to justify the resolution. And we prove to you that we ought to increase the number of people in AmeriCorps through the federal government.

First, the states can't amend a piece of federal legislation, which is what this bill does. And the national infrastructure of the plan is the crucial internal link to all of our solvency claims. From Shirley Sagawa, cited in the 1AC: "A universally available Summer of Service program would help fill this policy gap by helping communities create positive alternatives for young teens. Developing a national system to enable all young people to participate in service as a rite of passage would be possible if the system were built on the existing infrastructure of service and youth programs."

And finally, move on to spending. First, spending now is going to improve fiscal discipline and stewardship in the long term. From the Economic Policy Institute, online, 2003: "Spending proposals will actually improve fiscal stewardship in the long run as we learned during the late 1990s. Faster growth is the surest route to deficit reduction. By using temporary measures to prime the pump of the economy when we need to do so, we can lessen unemployment and improve prosperity while at the same time promoting fiscal integrity."

Also, extend the piece of evidence I read to you on topicality from Shirley Sagawa. It says that our plan would only cost \$100 million. Make them prove a brink that \$100 in