Now let’s look to our opponent’s case a little bit. Their first point talks about how the Kyoto Protocol is ineffective and how CO_2 even under best results will only result in only a one-twentieth degree in climate change. And what Oxford University says is that this is amazing. They compare changing climate change like reversing the direction of a train. You have to slow the train down, stop it, then reverse. So if we’re ready for the first step of an actual climate change protocol—reversing the process—I’d say that’s a significant step. Furthermore, you can look to Jason Schrogen, a professor of finance and economics at the University of Wyoming, who said that without the Kyoto Protocol, temperature will rise 2.5 degrees Celsius and with it will rise 1.5. We’re here about reversing climate change, but it’s not just going to happen overnight. Our opponents give you several other options that the United States has explored; however, none of these provide for an overnight climate change. If the Kyoto Protocol is already changing climate, that is more reason to affirm.

Then they talk about exempting developing countries, and we can really combine this with my third point, which told you how CDMs in developing nations will help them reduce their emissions and help us reduce our trade deficit with those countries. Countries like China stand to give us a substantial benefit while also reducing their own emissions and others around the world. Currently, according to the United Nations, there are 800 such projects and we’ve clearly seen success. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Control has followed the world over and has seen a net decrease of emissions by 5.9 percent; we’re looking at results here, not hypotheticals. And finally, they talk about Russia. However, Russia is a false … the whole market of the Kyoto is a false market. You need sellers and you need buyers. If Russia is a seller, then there are more buyers in the market and the whole market gets more valuable. So that’s why Russia essentially doesn’t matter.

Now their economy point. They tell how you need to look to all their statistics because … it’s just … they’re all bad. Well, we have some bad news for our opponents in the fact that we have statistics saying that the Kyoto Protocol can actually gain. The Department of Energy showed that we will actually save $585 billion in less gas usage. The average consumer will spend $567 to make the transition, but that they’ll save a net $1,978. The U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation showed how the GDP will increase by .4 percent in 2010 to .9 percent by 2020 and that will save 1.4 million jobs. Basically, we need to look at this holistically. There are estimates on both sides supporting both sides of the resolution. But what’s happening now in the Conference of Mayors shows you that it will work in the United States—that under the exact same standards we see results. We’re not offering you hypotheticals; we’re offering you reality, a $725 million savings per year as a reality under the exact same protocol. So that’s why you’re going to affirm because we’re offering you definite results.