

Q: You can do that?

A: Yes.

SECOND NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE SPEECH: MATT FISHER (GLENBROOK NORTH HIGH SCHOOL)

I would just like to reiterate Stephanie's thanks for the support of coaches, our friends, the esteemed judges, our opponents, and our generous sponsors, my parents, the NFL Committee, Vickie Fellers, the tab room staff, and the rest of the host committee for putting on such a well-run tournament. More than anyone, I would like to thank my partner, Stephanie Spies, for her work ethic, joviality, and amusing affinity for Wild West World.

I'll be addressing the spending, or federal budget disadvantage. There will be an overview on that; then I'll be addressing the case arguments.

Our spending argument demonstrates that you should vote negative in any paradigm. The impact to our disadvantage has a shorter time frame than the impact of the case because new spending will immediately threaten our national security priorities. Moreover, our Peterson evidence explains that the danger from overstressing our budgets include nuclear and biological war or terrorism, which is much greater in magnitude than the affirmative harms.

Our disadvantage also complicates the ability of the affirmative to solve the case because a world in which we are in a protracted war against other nations or another terrorist attack occurs, obviously the economy would be detrimentally affected, which 9/11 proves. As a policy-maker, you have an obligation to err on the side of caution as it relates to new government spending. Vote negative to reject the wastefulness of the affirmative. This is Weldon, a representative of Florida in the *FDCH Political Transcripts*, in 2002:

"In this time of uncertainty and war, we have a moral obligation to end the funding of poorly performing agencies and programs. A dollar spent on a program that does not help the people is a dollar we cannot spend on homeland security. It would be unconscionable to fund a poorly performing program when the physical safety of Americans requires that the government take on many additional expensive tasks. Working on behalf of all Americans, with that privilege comes the responsibility to use hard-earned taxpayer dollars wisely and effectively."

The first argument made in the 2AC is a piece of evidence from 2003 saying now is the critical time to stimulate the economy. First, the fact that this evidence is four years old is a reason that you should be highly skeptical of the government's ability to prime the pump of the economy. Second is that this does not assume the affirmative's means of