

increasing economic growth, but rather it is an economic theory argument that if the government were to cut taxes, for example, that would stimulate economic growth, not if they were able to spend on national service.

The second argument made in the 2AC is that the plan only costs one hundred million dollars. First, that begs the question of the word “only,” because that is the entirety of our disadvantage. Second, we disagree with their characterization .... Rather, our disadvantage is predicated on the type of spending they employ as much as the amount. The INC Brady evidence explains that new untouchable budget priorities have a spill-over effect where Congress winds up wasting five dollars for every dollar that actually funds the plan. Our Brady evidence is the most qualified source on this issue because he has served multiple terms in the House of Representatives. This argument also proves that the affirmative massively underestimates the amount the plan would cost in real spending, and that the majority of the spending would be wasteful. As a policy-maker, that proves you have an obligation to reject the affirmative.

In the context of AmeriCorps, it is nothing but a wasteful government bureaucracy. This is Sanchez, a fellow at the CATO Institute, in 2003:

“Even its own director described AmeriCorps as ‘another cumbersome, unpredictable government bureaucracy.’ AmeriCorps doesn’t just waste tax money; it diverts private contributions and volunteer time to the programs that bear its imprimatur.”

The third argument made in the 2AC is that there is no fiscal discipline now, but first their argument just says that the budget proposal that was recently passed contains a lot of earmarked spending. Our uniqueness evidence takes this into account by saying that Bush’s appointment of the new manager of the Office of Management and Budget is able to take into account this earmarked spending and that Bush would veto this spending when it actually came up before him.

Our next argument is that the U.S. economy is growing and is strong now. *Bloomberg News*, accessed online, 2007:

“Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas President Fisher said he expects accelerated growth in the U.S. economy in the second quarter. The economy is powerful.”

And, Bush will restrain excessive spending. This is Weisman, June 20, 2007, from *The New York Times*, accessed online:

“The administration has promised a hard line on spending. Bush praised Portman as pressing for keeping spending under control and reducing the deficit. ‘He’s put Democratic leaders in Congress on notice that I will veto bills with excessive levels of spending,’ the president said.”

And, even if government spending is high now, that just proves our argument. The majority of that spending is going to national defense, which is important to prevent a litany of catastrophes outlined in our Peterson evidence. The fact that the government is