laughable; they say it has absolutely no impact on the climate. If it has no impact and it has all of these repercussions, why exactly would we be compelled to ratify it? It exempts the developing countries and they're not going to get on the bandwagon post-2012, so they will remain exempt. Russia can actually increase their emissions levels by 30 percent under the Kyoto Protocol—it's so biased against the United States. The economic repercussions—you have to understand those 2.2 trillion dollars in abatement discounted over decades—that isn't federal spending, that's spending that comes out of the American people's pockets. That's spending that's going to increase our daily prices of gas, food, medical. You are allowing something that doesn't even solve to be put into place and it's going to increase our poverty level while decreasing our standard of living. I have a huge problem with that. There are other ways to do this. We have a capitalistic economy; we can do it through market-based incentives. The United States government is already investing in cleaner technology, and that would be just as effective.

JENNIFER GOLDSTEIN, STONEMAN DOUGLAS (SECOND PRO SPEECH):

Alright, are my judges ready? Opponents? First, I'll discuss our case and then move on to our opponents'. We do affirm today's resolution to affirm the Kyoto Protocol for four main reasons. We've seen it—as my partner had mentioned—it would improve U.S. international relations. We've seen its success in the United States. And because of the benefits reaped through utilizing India and China.

In addition to these points, I maintain that the longer we wait to join the Kyoto Protocol, the larger the loss in profit margins for our businesses. According to the Center of Environmental Evaluation on September 25, 2005, renewable energy will supply 14 percent of the world's needs by 2020 and 40 percent by 2040. Seeing these trends, the United States stands to gain or lose a significant amount of money. With the Kyoto Protocol, I'm showing a definitive gain. General Electric, for example, in April 2006 reported that because of changes and enhancements in their green research and development, revenues are expected to double by 2010. Jonathan Coller of the Department of Applied Economics in Cambridge showed how Denmark through its early—keyword *early*—investment in wind technology reaped substantial profits. Essentially, if a country wants to invest in greener technology, they are going to invest in countries with Kyoto Protocol restrictions, rather than countries outside of these obligations like the United States because these restrictions lead to the development of the most efficient technology the U.S. doesn't have the incentive or pressure to create themselves.