

# PLAN KILLING

*When you hear your opponents' plan, ask the following questions:*

- How much will it cost? Where will the funds come from?
- Does it solve the needs for change?
- Could the problem be more easily solved with some minor change?
- What proof is there that the plan will work?
- What protections are in place to monitor the success of the plan and remove it if it fails?
- How will the public be educated regarding the plan?
- Does the plan duplicate existing programs?
- Will the plan be consistent with Canada's legal system (not *is it legal*)?

## WHEN YOUR OPPONENTS DO THE UNEXPECTED

*Areas for clash focus*

- Is the definition legitimate?
  - » Truism/Tautology (if yes, redefine — if no, ignore)
  - » Inherent advantage to Affirmative (if very strong, redefine — otherwise ignore)
- Does this match our values?
- What practical problems will be associated with this?
- How much will this cost?
- Is this a significant change?
  - » What is the key point and how can it be attacked?
  - » How is there no change?
- Follow the argument to the extreme — what are the ramifications?
- Apply the Slippery Slope and do some fear mongering.
- Apply the emotional appeal: will this harm children or the elderly?