# 1nc vs Valley

## 1NC – Off

### Framing

#### Pleasure and pain are the starting point for moral reasoning—they’re our most baseline desires and the only things that explain the intrinsic value of objects or actions

Moen 16, Ole Martin (PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo). "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267.

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good. 3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value. Although pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called “evil pleasures”) and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called “noble pains”), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail. Though it is, of course, an open question whether other objections to P1 might be more successful, I shall assume that if (1)–(4) fail, we are justified in believing that P1 is true itself a paragon of freedom—there will always be some agents able to interfere substantially with one’s choices. The effective level of protection one enjoys, and hence one’s actual degree of freedom, will vary according to multiple factors: how powerful one is, how powerful individuals in one’s vicinity are, how frequent police patrols are, and so on. Now, we saw above that what makes a slave unfree on Pettit’s view is the fact that his master has the power to interfere arbitrarily with his choices; in other words, what makes the slave unfree is the power relation that obtains between his master and him. The difﬁculty is that, in light of the facts I just mentioned, there is no reason to think that this power relation will be unique. A similar relation could obtain between the master and someone other than the slave: absent perfect state control, the master may very well have enough power to interfere in the lives of countless individuals. Yet it would be wrong to infer that these individuals lack freedom in the way the slave does; if they lack anything, it seems to be security. A problematic power relation can also obtain between the slave and someone other than the master, since there may be citizens who are more powerful than the master and who can therefore interfere with the slave’s choices at their discretion. Once again, it would be wrong to infer that these individuals make the slave unfree in the same way that the master does. Something appears to be missing from Pettit’s view. If I live in a particularly nasty part of town, then it may turn out that, when all the relevant factors are taken into account, I am just as vulnerable to outside interference as are the slaves in the royal palace, yet it does not follow that our conditions are equivalent from the point of view of freedom. As a matter of fact, we may be equally vulnerable to outside interference, but as a matter of right, our standings could not be more different. I have legal recourse against anyone who interferes with my freedom; the recourse may not be very effective—presumably it is not, if my overall vulnerability to outside interference is comparable to that of a slave— but I still have full legal standing.68 By contrast, the slave lacks legal recourse against the interventions of one speciﬁc individual: his master. It is that fact, on a Kantian view—a fact about the legal relation in which a slave stands to his master—that sets slaves apart from freemen. The point may appear trivial, but it does get something right: whereas one cannot identify a power relation that obtains uniquely between a slave and his master, the legal relation between them is undeniably unique. A master’s right to interfere with respect to his slave does not extend to freemen, regardless of how vulnerable they might be as a matter of fact, and citizens other than the master do not have the right to order the slave around, regardless of how powerful they might be. This suggests that Kant is correct in thinking that the ideal of freedom is essentially linked to a person’s having full legal standing. More speciﬁcally, he is correct in holding that the importance of rights is not exhausted by their contribution to the level of protection that an individual enjoys, as it must be on an instrumental view like Pettit’s. Although it does matter that rights be enforced with reasonable effectiveness, the sheer fact that one has adequate legal rights is essential to one’s standing as a free citizen. In this respect, Kant stays faithful to the idea that freedom is primarily a matter of standing—a standing that the freeman has and that the slave lacks. Pettit himself frequently insists on the idea, but he fails to do it justice when he claims that freedom is simply a matter of being adequately (and reliably) shielded against the strength of others. As Kant recognizes, the standing of a free citizen is a more complex matter than that. One could perhaps worry that the idea of legal standing is something of a red herring here—that it must ultimately be reducible to a complex network of power relations and, hence, that the position I attribute to Kant differs only nominally from Pettit’s. That seems to me doubtful. Viewing legal standing as essential to freedom makes sense only if our conception of the former includes conceptions of what constitutes a fully adequate scheme of legal rights, appropriate legal recourse, justiﬁed punishment, and so on. Only if one believes that these notions all boil down to power relations will Kant’s position appear similar to Pettit’s. On any other view—and certainly that includes most views recently defended by philosophers—the notion of legal standing will outstrip the power relations that ground Pettit’s theory.

#### That justifies util – we must aggregate in order to determine how behaviors will be conducted based on what is most pleasurable. Anything else is arbitrary and always allows for exclusions, but aggregation solves because it allows us to determine what behaviors are most likely given relative evaluations of pleasure and pain.

#### Under the veil of ignorance, extinction would still outweigh because nobody would want to go extinct, no matter their position in the world.

#### Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well-being – prefer:

#### 1] Actor specificity

#### A] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### B] States lack wills or intentions since policies are collective actions. Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings. Link turns calc indites because the alt would be *no* action.

#### 2] **No act-omission distinction—governments are responsible for everything in the public sphere so inaction is implicit authorization of action: they have to yes/no bills, which means everything collapse to aggregation.**

#### 3] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital via intuitions. Intuitions outweigh—they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why.

#### 4] Existential threats independently outweigh – all life has infinite value and extinction eliminates the possibility for future generations

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>,

1.2. THE ETHICS OF EXISTENTIAL RISK In his book Reasons and Persons, Oxford philosopher Derek Parfit advanced an influential argument about the importance of avoiding extinction: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: (1) Peace. (2) A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population. (3) A nuclear war that kills 100%. (2) would be worse than (1), and (3) would be worse than (2). Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between (1) and (2). I believe that the difference between (2) and (3) is very much greater. ... The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these few thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between (2) and (3) may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second.65 In this argument, it seems that Parfit is assuming that the survivors of a nuclear war that kills 99% of the population would eventually be able to recover civilisation without long-term effect. As we have seen, this may not be a safe assumption – but for the purposes of this thought experiment, the point stands. What makes existential catastrophes especially bad is that they would “destroy the future,” as another Oxford philosopher, Nick Bostrom, puts it.66 This future could potentially be extremely long and full of flourishing, and would therefore have extremely large value. In standard risk analysis, when working out how to respond to risk, we work out the expected value of risk reduction, by weighing the probability that an action will prevent an adverse event against the severity of the event. Because the value of preventing existential catastrophe is so vast, even a tiny probability of prevention has huge expected value.67 Of course, there is persisting reasonable disagreement about ethics and there are a number of ways one might resist this conclusion.68 Therefore, it would be unjustified to be overconfident in Parfit and Bostrom’s argument. In some areas, government policy does give significant weight to future generations. For example, in assessing the risks of nuclear waste storage, governments have considered timeframes of thousands, hundreds of thousands, and even a million years.69 Justifications for this policy usually appeal to principles of intergenerational equity according to which future generations ought to get as much protection as current generations.70 Similarly, widely accepted norms of sustainable development require development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.71 However, when it comes to existential risk, it would seem that we fail to live up to principles of intergenerational equity. Existential catastrophe would not only give future generations less than the current generations; it would give them nothing. Indeed, reducing existential risk plausibly has a quite low cost for us in comparison with the huge expected value it has for future generations. In spite of this, relatively little is done to reduce existential risk. Unless we give up on norms of intergenerational equity, they give us a strong case for significantly increasing our efforts to reduce existential risks. 1.3. WHY EXISTENTIAL RISKS MAY BE SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERINVESTED IN, AND THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY In spite of the importance of existential risk reduction, it probably receives less attention than is warranted. As a result, concerted international cooperation is required if we are to receive adequate protection from existential risks. 1.3.1. Why existential risks are likely to be underinvested in There are several reasons why existential risk reduction is likely to be underinvested in. Firstly, it is a global public good. Economic theory predicts that such goods tend to be underprovided. The benefits of existential risk reduction are widely and indivisibly dispersed around the globe from the countries responsible for taking action. Consequently, a country which reduces existential risk gains only a small portion of the benefits but bears the full brunt of the costs. Countries thus have strong incentives to free ride, receiving the benefits of risk reduction without contributing. As a result, too few do what is in the common interest. Secondly, as already suggested above, existential risk reduction is an intergenerational public good: most of the benefits are enjoyed by future generations who have no say in the political process. For these goods, the problem is temporal free riding: the current generation enjoys the benefits of inaction while future generations bear the costs. Thirdly, many existential risks, such as machine superintelligence, engineered pandemics, and solar geoengineering, pose an unprecedented and uncertain future threat. Consequently, it is hard to develop a satisfactory governance regime for them: there are few existing governance instruments which can be applied to these risks, and it is unclear what shape new instruments should take. In this way, our position with regard to these emerging risks is comparable to the one we faced when nuclear weapons first became available. Cognitive biases also lead people to underestimate existential risks. Since there have not been any catastrophes of this magnitude, these risks are not salient to politicians and the public.72 This is an example of the misapplication of the availability heuristic, a mental shortcut which assumes that something is important only if it can be readily recalled. Another cognitive bias affecting perceptions of existential risk is scope neglect. In a seminal 1992 study, three groups were asked how much they would be willing to pay to save 2,000, 20,000 or 200,000 birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups answered $80, $78, and $88, respectively.73 In this case, the size of the benefits had little effect on the scale of the preferred response. People become numbed to the effect of saving lives when the numbers get too large. 74 Scope neglect is a particularly acute problem for existential risk because the numbers at stake are so large. Due to scope neglect, decision-makers are prone to treat existential risks in a similar way to problems which are less severe by many orders of magnitude. A wide range of other cognitive biases are likely to affect the evaluation of existential risks.75
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### DA – Infrastructure

#### Infrastructure will pass – Biden gets it done and it is enough for climate

Clayton 11/4 [Ag Policy Editor Chris Clayton has been writing and editing for DTN/The Progressive Farmer since 2005 after working more than seven years as a reporter for the Omaha World-Herald. Chris has been recognized as writer of the year by the American Agricultural Editors' Association and won story of the year multiple times from the organization. He also has won the Glenn Cunningham Agricultural Journalist of the Year Award from the North American Agricultural Journalists and served as the group's president in 2012-13. The National Farmers Union and American Coalition for Ethanol also each have named Chris communicator of the year. November 4, 2021. “Democrats move to vote on Policy agenda” [https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/news/article/2021/11/04/biden-reflects-urgency-get-things Accessed 11/4](https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/news/article/2021/11/04/biden-reflects-urgency-get-things%20Accessed%2011/4) //gord0]

OMAHA (DTN) -- After key election losses such as the Virginia governor's race, House Democrats are seeking to move ahead on President Joe Biden's domestic policies with an expected vote on the $1.75 trillion "Build Back Better Act."

The newest version of the bill was sent to the House Rules Committee on Wednesday afternoon with the committee holding a marathon late-night hearing to detail rules for debate if the bill gets to a floor vote this week.

Speaking at the White House on Wednesday, Biden said he understands people want to see Democrats "get things done." The president said he's pushing members of his party to give final passage to the $1.2 trillion infrastructure bill, as well as the mix of social programs and tax changes in the Build Back Better Act.

"People are upset and uncertain about a lot of things -- from COVID, to school, to jobs, to a whole range of things, and the cost of a gallon of gasoline," Biden said. "And so, if I'm able to pass -- sign into law my Build Back Better initiative, I'm in a position where you're going to see a lot of those things ameliorated quickly and swiftly. And so that has to be done."

Still, Biden's agenda remains caught between moderates and liberals in his own party, leaving open questions of whether House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., can schedule a floor vote on the bill.

The House Agriculture Committee released details highlighting $87.4 billion in spending on agriculture, including $28 billion for conservation programs, $27 billion for forestry, $18 billion for rural development, $12 billion for farmer debt relief and $2 billion for agricultural research.

On taxes, the bill changes the current 21% rate and provides a tax cut to 18% for corporations with taxable income below $400,000. The tax is increased to 26.5% for corporations with incomes higher than $5 million. The bill also sets a minimum 15% corporate tax for companies that zero out their tax liability.

The bill also boosts the valuation benefit of Section 2032 A for farmland, raising the land value deduction from $750,000 to $11.7 million.

The bill also increases taxes on higher-income people and limits deductions of qualified business income (Section 199A) for married couples with more than $500,000 in taxable income on a joint return.

For families, the bill extends the $3,600 Child Tax Credit and expands the Earned Income Credit for low-wage workers without children.

A provision drawing criticism is an agreement to expand the State and Local Taxes (SALT) deduction from $10,000 to $72,500. Republicans pointed out the provision largely helps wealthier people because most people now take advantage of the $24,000 standard deduction.

More Recommended for You

"The people left in the poor rural areas of my district are going to get left out," said Rep. Tom Rice, R-S.C., pointing to the changes on SALT.

The bill also includes a provision allowing Health and Human Services officials to negotiate certain prescription drug prices for Medicare.

Despite earlier objections from the Senate parliamentarian, the House bill also includes immigration provisions, including granting permanent residency status for farmworkers and other undocumented immigrations who were considered essential workers early in the pandemic. The bill also includes legal immigration status for children who came into the U.S. with their parents, known as "Dreamers." The White House stated the bill also will reform the immigration system to reduce the visa backlog.

The White House released a fact sheet on rural communities, championing the "landmark new program," the Rural Partnership Program, which will provide $970 million for states and tribes to use for competitive rural economic grant programs.

Kelliann Blazek, special assistant to the president for agriculture and rural policy, highlighted the Rural Partnership Program in an interview with DTN. Blazek noted that eight out of 10 counties with high levels of poverty are in rural areas of the country and have fewer resources for local development.

"So, we're taking a bottom-up approach and putting rural communities in the driver's seat so they have the tools and resources to evaluate their goals and then we'll help them get there," Blazek said.

The White House also spotlighted $9.7 billion in loans for rural electric providers and a separate $2.88 billion for electric loans to boost renewable energy. The investment is the largest since the Rural Electrification Act for providing energy to rural America, the White House stated.

On the $28 billion in conservation spending, the bill increases funds for USDA's major conservation programs to focus on climate-smart agricultural practices. That includes $9 billion for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), $7.45 billion for the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP), $4.1 billion for the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP), and $1.7 billion for the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program. The White House stated that "at its peak," the climate-smart programs could reach as many as 130 million crop acres.

"The president believes farmers and ranchers are part of the solution when it comes to climate change, and from the very start of this administration, we've been seeking input from and listening to farmers and ranchers and rural communities to inform our climate agenda," Blazek said.

Republicans testifying before the Rules Committee challenged the $1.75 trillion costs of the bill, arguing the actual costs were higher. They added that the costs of the bill would add "further fuel for the fire" on inflation. Pointing to the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps that would operate out of USDA, Rep. Bruce Westerman, R-Ark., said the recreation of a 1930s New Deal program would compete for workers.

"Why create a government jobs program when every employer I run across tells me they can't find people to work," Westerman said.

Rep. Jim McGovern, D-Mass., chairman of the House Rules Committee, pointed to the benefit of the reconciliation package and the $1.2 trillion Senate-passed infrastructure bill, which is tied up because House Democrats will not pass it until they vote on the Build Back Better Act. McGovern noted Republicans could not get an infrastructure bill passed when President Donald Trump was in charge and Republicans controlled Congress.

"Every week was infrastructure week," McGovern said. He added, "The reason I am anxious to get both of these bills done is people want us to deliver. They are tired of talk and no action. And, you know, they are tired of the polarization. And so, you know, people are talking about these bills as a political calculation, but at the end of the day, you know, if we can get this done, it's going to be meaningful in people's lives," McGovern said.

#### Strengthening unions requires Biden’s political capital – PRO act proves

Birenbaum 21 [Charles S. Birenbaum serves as the firm’s Chair of Northern California and Co-Chair of the firm’s Labor & Employment Practice’s Labor-Management Relations group. Chuck is an experienced labor and employment attorney who focuses his practice on traditional labor and employment law matters, and has wide-ranging experience litigating in state and federal courts as well as various administrative agencies. March 12, 2021. “The New New Deal? U.S. House Of Representatives Passes Sweeping Labor Reform With Significant but Uncertain Future” [https://www.natlawreview.com/article/new-new-deal-us-house-representatives-passes-sweeping-labor-reform-significant Accessed 10/27](https://www.natlawreview.com/article/new-new-deal-us-house-representatives-passes-sweeping-labor-reform-significant%20Accessed%2010/27) //gord0]

Unions are back in the news. On March 9, 2021, the U.S. House of Representatives successfully passed the Protect the Right to Organize Act (the PRO Act), legislation designed to overhaul the current labor relations framework—touching on issues including independent contractors, joint employers, employee arbitration agreements, and new union organizing rules. While Senate passage may not happen, President Biden’s insistence on being the “most pro-union president” could make the PRO Act a legislative priority later in his term.

**I.  Expanding the Class of Covered Employees**

The PRO Act contains a host of laws and definitional revisions that significantly expand the class of employees covered by the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. |  | Independent Contractor Classifications |

The PRO Act redefines “employees” under the NLRA, by codifying the “ABC Test” for independent contractors used by certain states (such as California and Massachusetts). In practice, this new definition will significantly expand the class of eligible “employees” entitled to unionization and collective bargaining rights by making it more difficult for employers to categorize workers as independent contractors.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| b. |  | Joint-Employer Classifications |

The PRO Act redefines “employers” under the NLRA, by codifying the liberal joint-employer standard announced in Browning-Ferris Industries, (2015) 362 NLRB No. 186. The new standard looks to the “right-to-control” any terms and conditions of employment of a workforce, even if indirectly and even if never exercised in fact. This test will create labor liability for businesses that traditionally have not had that liability.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| c. |  | State Right-To-Work Laws |

The PRO Act overturns all state “right-to-work” laws. States would no longer be able to prohibit union security and dues check-off clauses if placed in collective bargaining agreements. Mandatory union dues deduction for virtually all employees covered by a collective bargaining agreement could provide unions with financial incentives to bolster their efforts in the 27 states currently with right-to-work laws.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| d. |  | Employee Arbitration Agreements |

The PRO Act outlaws class, collective, and joint-action employment arbitration agreements—rending them illegal. The change would circumvent the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision, Epic Systems Corp v. Lewis (2018) 138 S. Ct. 1612, upholding the use of these types of agreements under the Federal Arbitration Act.

**II.  Employer and Union Economic Pressure Tactics**

Hard bargaining is often an inescapable reality of unions relations, and one that has been finely tuned through legislation, litigation, and judicial precedent over the last 90 years. The PRO Act disrupts that balance by changing the rules of engagement for unions and employers alike—with preferential treatment of union rights. For unions, the PRO Act lifts the ban on previously prohibited tactics like recurrent and intermittent strikes, as well as secondary boycotts and related pressure tactics against neutral third parties, like the protest or picketing of an employer’s clients, customers, or vendors. For employers, the PRO Act goes the other direction by imposing new bans on previously common and currently lawful tactics, such as pre-strike lockouts and the hiring of permanent replacement workers for striking employees—a significant blow to employers’ bargaining leverage and ability to operate during a strike.

**III.  Employer, Union, and Employee Communication Rights**

Communication during election campaigns and collective bargaining is integral for all sides—providing a platform to air grievances and novel perspectives on the relative pros and cons of unionization or contracted terms. The PRO Act alters these rights in several ways. For employers, the PRO Act prohibits the holding of mandatory employment meetings where they can educate employees on the employer’s historic experiences and perspectives. In contrast, the bill forces employers to allow employees to use company devices and email systems for any union organizing or concerted, protected activity—even though not work-related. And in advance of the elections themselves, employers are obligated to turn over employees’ personal contact information to unions.

**IV.  Union Election and Collective Bargaining Practices**

Elections and collective bargaining lie at the heart of modern labor law. The PRO Act disrupts longstanding practices in these critical areas. On the elections side, the Act gives unions substantial control of the appropriate bargaining unit, as well as the method and location of elections, while depriving employers of standing to intervene in the decision-making process regarding those issues. When determining the results of an election, the Act imposes harsh penalties for the commission of unfair labor practices by the employer, including bargaining orders irrespective of employee votes against unionization. And once bargaining begins, in certain cases the parties are required to reach agreement within 90 days or become subject to mandatory mediation and interest arbitration—all of which stands as an overhaul to current practices.

**V.  Increase in Employer Exposure**

Employer exposure for NLRA violations is also increased under the PRO Act. Liability would include: (a) backpay; (b) front pay; (c) consequential damages; (d) liquidated damages; (e) civil penalties; and (f) punitive damages. Depending on the violation and circumstances, civil penalties can range as high as $100,000 per violation and be imposed against employers, officers, and directors. The Act also gives employees a private right of action to pursue certain remedies in federal court—a break from the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) prior jurisdictional exclusivity.

**VI.  Moving Forward**

The PRO Act’s passage in the Senate appears a challenge. Despite sweeping approval by the House and even modest bipartisan support, Senate passage remains a significant hurdle. Under current Senate rules, to avoid filibuster, the Act would require all 50 Democratic votes and 10 Republican votes—neither of which appears likely based on recent history. And legislative alternatives to gridlock, such as budget reconciliation or abolishing the filibuster, may also encounter significant resistance. Given President Biden’s public and oft-repeated support for labor unions, it remains to be seen whether the PRO Act, and political capital necessary for its passage, ultimately become a larger priority for President Biden further into his term.

#### Bidens PC is what got infrastructure through the senate, and its key now.

Smith and Gambino 10/1 [David Smith is the Guardian's Washington DC bureau chief. Lauren Gambino is political correspondent for Guardian US, based in Washington DC. October 1, 2021. “Biden upbeat on rare Capitol Hill visit but domestic agenda hangs in jeopardy” [https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/oct/01/democrats-congress-biden-infrastructure-talks Accessed 10/25](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/oct/01/democrats-congress-biden-infrastructure-talks%20Accessed%2010/25) //gord0]

Democrats returned to the Capitol on Friday deeply divided but determined to make progress on Joe Biden’s ambitious economic vision, after an embarrassing setback delayed a planned vote on a related $1tn measure to improve the nation’s infrastructure.

Biden on Friday made a rare visit to Capitol Hill to meet privately with House Democrats amid a stalemate that has put his sprawling domestic agenda in jeopardy. The visit comes after after the House speaker, Nancy Pelosi, [delayed a vote on part of his economic agenda,](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/sep/30/biden-nancy-pelosi-infrastructure-bill) a bipartisan $1tn public works measure, on Thursday night after a frantic day of negotiations failed to produce a deal.

“We’re going to get this thing done,” Biden said, as he exited the caucus room. “It doesn’t matter when – it doesn’t matter whether it’s in six minutes, six days, or six weeks – we’re going to get it done.”

Earlier in the day, Pelosi promised that there would be a “vote today” on the measure, an ambitious timeline that would require Democrats first reaching a compromise on the broader piece of Biden’s agenda that virtually every member of the party in both the House and Senate could support. But a resolution before the weekend appeared unlikely as Democrats remained deeply at odds over the scale and structure of a more expansive package containing containing a host of progressive priorities, provisions to expand health care access, establish paid leave, combat climate change and reduce poverty – all underwritten by tax increases on wealthy Americans and corporations.

Democrats are trying to score a major legislative victory with razor-thin majorities in both chambers. Failure would deny Biden much of his domestic agenda, leaving the party with little to show for their time controlling the White House, the Senate and House – a governing trifecta they last enjoyed in 2010.

Senator Joe Manchin of West Virginia has proposed a spending package of about $1.5tn – less than half the size of the proposal put forward by the president and Democratic leaders. Another Democratic centrist, Senator Kyrsten Sinema, declined to say whether she agreed with Manchin’s proposal.

The wrangling resumed in the House on Friday morning, which, due to a quirk of process, [remained](https://twitter.com/HouseDailyPress/status/1443770307903475712) in the legislative day of 30 September even as the calendar turned to October.

Huddled together in an hours-long caucus meeting, Pelosi tried to steer the feuding factions within her party toward common ground after Thursday’s marathon negotiating session generated deepening acrimony and no deal.

Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal, chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, emerged from the morning gathering optimistic that Democrats would eventually pass both bills. But she remained firm in her position – and confident in her members – that there the infrastructure bill would not move forward without assurances that the Senate would pass Biden’s larger bill.

“We’ve seen more progress in the last 48 hours than we’ve seen in a long time on reconciliation,” she said, crediting progressives’ infrastructure revolt for forcing Manchin and Sinema to the negotiating table.

The decision to postpone the infrastructure vote was seen as a victory for progressives who were unwavering in their resolve to “hold the line” and vote against the bill unless they received “ironclad” commitments that Biden’s proposed $3.5tn social and environmental package would also pass.

Many progressives also say they will withhold support for the infrastructure bill until the Senate passes the second piece of Biden’s economic agenda, legislation that has yet to be written. Jayapal made clear this was her preference, but later left the door open to the possibility that the party could reach an agreement without a vote.

“If there’s something else that’s short of a vote … that gives me those same assurances, I want to listen to that,” she told reporters.

The stalemate also laid bare deep ideological fractures within the party. Unlike the debate over Barack Obama’s healthcare legislation a decade ago, progressives appear to be more closely aligned with the president and able to flex their political muscles. On Thursday they were united in making the case that centrists are now in the minority.

Varshini Prakash, executive director of Sunrise Movement, a youth group fighting the climate crisis, [said:](https://mailchi.mp/sunrisemovement/sunrise-movement-responds-to-delay-of-bif-sinema-and-manchin-are-to-blame?e=18cba0fd52) “Tonight, we are so proud of progressives for holding the line. But let’s be clear, progressives are not the ones delaying the vote – Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema are.”

Thursday’s delay could anger moderates and cause further infighting that puts Biden’s agenda at risk. Earlier this week Stephanie Murphy, a congresswoman from Florida, warned: “If the vote were to fail or be delayed, there would be a significant breach of trust.”

Republicans who had supported the infrastructure bill in the Senate also acknowledged the setback. Senators Rob Portman, Bill Cassidy, Susan Collins, Lisa Murkowski and Mitt Romney said in a joint statement: “While we are disappointed the [House of Representatives](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/house-of-representatives) did not meet its deadline to vote on the bipartisan infrastructure bill, we remain hopeful the House will come together in a spirit of bipartisanship just as the Senate did and pass this important piece of legislation.

“This bill is critically important to modernizing and upgrading everything from our roads and bridges to broadband and increasing the resiliency of the nation’s electrical grid.”

Both pieces of legislation are critical to Biden’s economic vision. While he has staked his domestic agenda – and his legacy – on a $3.5tn social policy package, he invested precious political capital in courting Republicans to support the infrastructure bill, part of a campaign promise to usher in a new era of bipartisanship in Congress. The bill passed the Senate in August, with 19 Republican votes and great fanfare.

#### Infrastructure reform solves Climate Change, extinction!

USA Today 7-20 7-20-2021 "Climate change is at 'code red' status for the planet, and inaction is no longer an option" <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/todaysdebate/2021/07/20/climate-change-biden-infrastructure-bill-good-start/7877118002/> //Elmer

**Not long ago**, **climate change** for many Americans **was** like **a distant bell**. News of starving polar bears or melting glaciers was tragic and disturbing, but other worldly. Not any more. **Top climate scientists** from around the world **warned of a "code red for humanity**" in a report issued Monday that says severe, human-caused global warming is become unassailable. Proof of the findings by the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is a now a factor of daily life. Due to **intense heat waves and drought**, 107 wildfires – including the largest ever in California – are now raging across the West, consuming 2.3 million acres. Earlier this summer, hundreds of people died in unprecedented triple-digit heat in Oregon, Washington and western Canada, when a "heat dome" of enormous proportions settled over the region for days. Some victims brought by stretcher into crowded hospital wards had body temperatures so high, their nervous systems had shut down. People collapsed trying to make their way to cooling shelters. Heat-trapping greenhouse gases Scientists say the event was almost **certainly made worse and more intransigent by human-caused climate change**. They attribute it to a combination of warming Arctic temperatures and a growing accumulation of heat-trapping greenhouse gases caused by the burning of fossil fuels. The **consequences of** what mankind has done to the atmo**sphere are now inescapable**. Periods of **extreme heat** are projected to **double** in the lower 48 states by 2100. **Heat deaths** are far **outpacing every other form of weather killer** in a 30-year average. A **persistent megadrought** in America's West continues to create tinder-dry conditions that augur another devastating wildfire season. And scientists say **warming oceans** are **fueling** ever **more powerful storms**, evidenced by Elsa and the early arrival of hurricane season this year. Increasingly severe weather is causing an estimated $100 billion in damage to the United States every year. "It is honestly surreal to see your projections manifesting themselves in real time, with all the suffering that accompanies them. It is heartbreaking," said climate scientist Katharine Hayhoe. **Rising seas** from global warming Investigators are still trying to determine what led to the collapse of a Miami-area condominium that left more than 100 dead or missing. But one concerning factor is the corrosive effect on reinforced steel structures of encroaching saltwater, made worse in Florida by a foot of rising seas from global warming since the 1900s. The clock is ticking for planet Earth. While the U.N. report concludes some level of severe climate change is now unavoidable, there is still a window of time when far more catastrophic events can be mitigated. But mankind must act soon to curb the release of heat-trapping gases. Global **temperature** has **risen** nearly **2 degrees** Fahrenheit since the pre-industrial era of the late 19th century. Scientists warn that in a decade, it could surpass a **2.7**-degree increase. That's **enough** warming **to cause catastrophic climate changes**. After a brief decline in global greenhouse gas emissions during the pandemic, pollution is on the rise. Years that could have been devoted to addressing the crisis were wasted during a feckless period of inaction by the Trump administration. Congress must act Joe Biden won the presidency promising broad new policies to cut America's greenhouse gas emissions. But Congress needs to act on those ideas this year. Democrats cannot risk losing narrow control of one or both chambers of Congress in the 2022 elections to a Republican Party too long resistant to meaningful action on the climate. So what's at issue? A trillion dollar **infrastructure bill** negotiated between Biden and a group of centrist senators (including 10 Republicans) is a start. In addition to repairing bridges, roads and rails, it would **improve access** by the nation's power infrastructure **to renewable energy sources,** **cap millions of abandoned oil and gas wells spewing greenhouse gases**, **and harden structures against climate change**. It also **offers tax credits for** the **purchase of electric vehicles** and funds the construction of charging stations. (**The nation's largest source of climate pollution are gas-powered vehicles**.) Senate approval could come very soon. Much **more is needed** if the nation is going to reach Biden's necessary goal of cutting U.S. climate pollution in half from 2005 levels by 2030. His ideas worth considering include a federal clean electricity standard for utilities, federal investments and tax credits to promote renewable energy, and tens of billions of dollars in clean energy research and development, including into ways of extracting greenhouse gases from the skies. Another idea worth considering is a fully refundable carbon tax. **The vehicle** for these additional proposals **would be a second infrastructure bill**. And if Republicans balk at the cost of such vital investment, Biden is rightly proposing to pass this package through a process known as budget reconciliation, which allows bills to clear the Senate with a simple majority vote. These are drastic legislative steps. But drastic times call for them. And when Biden attends a U.N. climate conference in November, he can use American progress on climate change as a mean of persuading others to follow our lead. Further delay is not an option.