Sure, here's a simple example of an objection speech using the factual-counterargument format:

Introduction:

Ladies and gentlemen, today I stand in opposition to the proposition that "Implementing a nationwide ban on plastic bags will substantially improve environmental outcomes."

Factual Argument 1: Current Usage and Impact

Proponents claim that banning plastic bags will significantly reduce pollution. It's true that plastic bags are a part of the waste stream, but they only account for a small percentage of litter. According to a study by the International Coastal Cleanup, plastic bags make up less than 1% of the total debris.

Counterargument 1: Alternative Solutions

Instead of a nationwide ban, promoting recycling and biodegradable options could be more effective. Countries like Germany have implemented successful recycling programs, reducing plastic waste without outright bans. This approach not only addresses the waste issue but also promotes sustainable practices.

Factual Argument 2: Economic Implications

The proposed ban could have negative economic effects. It's a fact that the plastic manufacturing industry provides jobs for thousands of Americans. A report by the Institute for Local Self-Reliance states that the plastic and resin sector supports over 1 million jobs.

Counterargument 2: Job Creation Through Innovation
While proponents of the ban argue that it will drive innovation in alternatives, it's worth considering that innovation can be incentivized without a strict ban. Encouraging companies to develop recycling technologies or reusable bag options can create new industries and employment opportunities without the disruption of a ban.
Conclusion:

In conclusion, while the environmental concerns surrounding plastic bags are valid, a nationwide ban is not the most pragmatic or effective solution. Through enhanced recycling efforts and innovation in biodegradable options, we can address pollution without causing economic disruption. Thank you.