

Feedback.

Prop

- enthusiastic presentations
- good level of engagement
- make better use of time - particularly w/ 2nd speaker

↳ Indigenous population!
(History does not particularly support your point so needed to hear this plan of action more clearly)

↳ Provs forced to act on these issues.

1st: 80

2nd: 78

Op

- strong content
- good balance of specific examples - nice "world" created.
- Encourage you to take more Ppt.
- make better use of time - particularly w/ 2nd speaker.



BALLOT

1st: 81

2nd: 80

SWITCH NAMES

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JULIA LAY No. of Judges: _____ Round: _____ Room: _____

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SOREL Team Name: MONT LAURIER

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____ First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Muhammed

Antoine

Ashton

Darica

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 147 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 149 |
| 200 |

not this, this is still right

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

→ unorganized, could benefit from speaking slower.
→ Good point ~~about~~ ^{entitled} "political diversity" but the point was not about POLITICAL diversity, which was confusing and at times irrelevant.
→ Build down very well-structured, but spent 30 seconds introducing (too long IMO).

Second Proposition

→ Weak point about separatism! I don't buy that ~~the federal~~ ^{the federal} government is THAT out of touch with provincial needs, this took credibility away a little.
→ ~~strong~~ ^{strong} and clear refutation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

→ Spent way too long on intro (1:15)
→ Strong point about the role of the Federal gov't to ~~govern~~ ^{govern} the collective of Canada, which he would have provided even a hypothetical example. especially
→ Lacked organization (between points) could benefit from talking slower
→ Good refutation

Second Opposition

→ Clear speaking style
→ Good refutation about increased case for provincial gov'ts to be stronger against the environment but did not tell me why the federal government would be BETTER with way lower.
→ Weak point about Canada setting the example, given that ~~it is~~ ^{it is} contingent on their plan going well

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BRIAN CAGHY

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 1 Room: A206

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SAINTE ADÈLE

Team Name: CHATEAU GUY

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Dylan Lee DANIEL BERGHEIM

EMMA-JANE BULLS Kaari Urbaneck.

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| 82 |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| 76 |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| 84 |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| 82 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 158 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 166 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

*SOME KEY OPP ARGUMENTS
WERE NOT REFUTED.*

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Zac Beasman

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: N340

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Louisville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Arija O'Brien

Margaret Goulding

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 72 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Granby

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kendal Barnes

Hily Rich

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 148 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 147 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

→ Great speaking style

→ Spoke well here

Rest of comments given in Round

→ Oh need for better analysis

→ Great PMRE → good summary addresses important points

→ Good refutation in summary speech

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

→ Good call out of talk of refutation on opp

→ Good style! Keep it up

→ try and fill time!
→ even if you are being repetitive

→ try and stay on topic
Got a little derailed when

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. HASTINGS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A-205

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ACTON VALE

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

PATRICK ANNA BEADAY

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 73 |
| 100 |

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 72 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: VAL d'OR

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

ANNE KIMPTON LAUREN CHANG

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 77 |
| 100 |

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 76 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 145 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 153 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- keep intro to a minimum
- use a more persuasive tone
- help judges follow your arguments by using signposts throughout your speech
- back down was good - those points should have been presented earlier

Second Proposition

- great persuasive tone
- do less reading, instead clash with your opponent's case
- tell me about your case, rather than highlighting strengths of opp's case

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- excellent signposting - very organized presentation
- use more concrete examples to illustrate arguments
- good identification of theme

Second Opposition

- excellent signposting - very organized presentation
- good intro of new actor, but could have been more thoroughly analyzed

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Allie

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A205

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker:

Patorck

Second Speaker:

Anna

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nal d'or

First Speaker:

Anne

Second Speaker:

Lauren

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 72 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 145 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 151 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

1. Prove impacts of better consultation and link to the motion
2. good structure

Second Proposition

1. Have a constructive part
2. Use facts to help your case
3. good world building

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

1. have concrete examples of spillover effects
2. good impacts

Second Opposition

1. Mech the implementation of several gov policies
2. good job bringing a new actor (populists)

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alexandro Koutoubis

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A205

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Patrick

Anna Deary

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 72 72 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Val d'Or

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anne Hinton

Lauren Chan

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

145

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

151

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- C. tax
- actors
- E.N. → good point
- Corp → link good to unclear up
- Pol 3:55

ballot + use

themselves?

Good points but use them in S.P. or F.P.

Second Proposition

- Pol 1:30
- in the way too long
- lots of good ex
- public speech

don't say why they are good
don't ever bring up their point
then don't say why they are bad

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- pol 3:15
- good resp to pol 2 → second could have been better who makes the right
- good point in 2:15 make (to fill point

builds

{ I don't make new points }
I tell us what they haven't closed with (everything)

Second Opposition

- pol 2:40
- if it's a prep round you both need make ex

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Soshwa Cohen

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A305

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Napierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Max Mitchell

Aidan Eisan

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ashley Lu

Yusuf Elmarsogly

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 81 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| 152 |
|-----|
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| 160 |
|-----|
| 200 |

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Don't leave your opponent standing too long for a POI
- Give more context for your examples
- How does your motion change the status quo?
- Be careful of new material in the reply

Second Proposition

- Constructive first
- Analyze all your assertions
- Rebuilding

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good Response to the POI.
- Why is your world different from gov's world?
- Don't only give a line of refutation explain why it takes a point down
- The other arguments that win your themes might not be the pts the 2nd speaker should brought

Second Opposition

- Constructive first
- Examples are not enough, give analysis

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keenan MacNeal

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A305

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Napierville

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Max

Aidan

Ashley

Yusuf

| Score |
|-----------|
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-----------|
| <u>78</u> |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-----------|
| <u>80</u> |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-----------|
| <u>81</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>154</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>161</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Bernice Lucas

No. of Judges: 2 Round: 1 Room: _____

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Napierville

First Speaker:

Max Mitchell

Second Speaker:

Aidan Eisan

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>78</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>80</u> |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker:

Ashley Liu

Second Speaker:

yusef Elmaroghy

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>81</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>158</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>157</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

*Good rebuttal - many a number of good points made today!
Little less reading please.*

Second Proposition

*Well done!
you brought up some good points regarding the Provinces knowing their own needs!*

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

*Very good effort!
slow down - pace yourself*

Second Opposition

*Well done!
well paced - points were easy to follow*

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jack Stewart

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 2 Room: M344

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sean Oh

Simran Vig

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rhea Gupta

Aliya Kabani

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 159 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 157 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

It would help to spend more time on core arguments and less on framing.
* You had excellent style, and a logical delivery, but impact your points more

Second Proposition

- good rebuttal and a strong second point but make sure you call back your rebuttal addresses the core of their case

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Points were well developed, but were of limited scope + impact
- why is international policy the main thing we need to worry about?

Second Opposition

move to the bottom point was strong be careful to impact and weigh it more in the round.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Abigail Trevino

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 1 Room: M339

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Bruno

Team Name: Bowie Cornea

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Sai

Daniella

Thomas Beschell Simran Dhami

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>80</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>81</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>78</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>77</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>161</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won
by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>155</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Always spell out the exact wording of motion! Good Analysis, argumentation, engagement, + examples

Second Proposition

Fantastic second speech, excellent rebuttal of most of OP's points.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good examples, try to engage more with other side.

Second Opposition

"

"

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon Braccwell

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: A207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Varennas

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Sahasro Bhowmik Lucas Terry

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>75</u> |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Danae Papelessis Ava Olin

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>79</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>78</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>151</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>157</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Try to define all of the terms of the debate.

Why is Provincial Autonomy good?

Second Proposition

Organize your speech

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

What is the status quo?

How does it compare?

Second Opposition

Reconstruction is not repeating

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Asghar Taqvi

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Varenes

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sahasro Rounik

Lucas Tarry

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Pepehassis

Ava Olin

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

149

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

157

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Define the motion
- ↳ "environmental legislation", "full authority" are important terms
- Is the ability to choose really as important as environmental impact.

Second Proposition

- 2 points might not have been the best idea for second prop
- Not enough impact on why promises helping their businesses helps the environment
- Try to keep giving POIs in mind

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Make sure that you don't put too much filler into your speech, you can always give more substantial analysis or refutation
- Address and explain why the status quo is better than the action proposed
- Good logic for your points, I was convinced

Second Opposition

- Make sure to understand rebutting
- Try to give a bit more thought on answering points
- Good integration of your example at the point

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Foster Salpeter

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Varenes

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sahasra Bhowmik

Lucas Tarry

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Papalassis

Ava Olin

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

154

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

160

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good, clear speaking style, arguments flushed out well

Biggest problem came with controlling the frame and stakes of debate:

Is this about passing legislation, or about provincial rights?

Individual choice as foundation of democracy needed flushing out

We needed some kind of constitutional analysis, and better assessment of states quo

Second Proposition

Could have given more time to refutation and rebuilding
2nd point seemed like an extension of point 2 (from PM)

I'd suggest dealing with opp. points individually (and named). This makes refutation more specific/easier to follow.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good constructive material, order of points should have been switched (2nd point was heavier)

I really liked point 2, ended up weighing the most on the debate

Would have been great to connect it to "individual choice" argument from Prop.

Refutation could have been stronger for 1st point on gov.: needed an explanation as to why provinces are worse at enforcement

Second Opposition

Good explanation of stakes, came out too late! (partner should have used it)

Strongest refutation (and most decisive) of round: env: concerned not in self-interest!

→ a flushing out of this would have been phenomenal: ask yourself why

Rebuilding also strongest, but similar problem: I need to know why the federal gov't is best suited for enforcement

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Arianna Galbraith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Port Cartier

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Briley Hillyard Xander Biddulph

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 76 |
| 100 |

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 74 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Helen Pan

Emily Li

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 80 |
| 100 |

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 77 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 150 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 157 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- explain how things work
- good POI

Second Proposition

- explain why
- good refutation just need to attack bigger arguments.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- don't read
- don't base refutation off of an example, attack entire point.

Second Opposition

- try to attack the bigger arguments.

Ceylan Borges Junior National Debating Championships

M243
243

Judge's Name: Ceylan Borges

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: 243

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Port Cartier

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Briley Hillgard Xander Biddwin

Helen Pan Emily Li

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 72 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 145 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 152 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: climate change 1 POT
First Proposition

- 1- each province is unique
- 2- Fed. change incentivizes provinces to make their own changes
- 1- Fed. gov overlooks smaller needs/ issues
Focus on "central Canada"
- minorities are not represented/ lack of representation
- 2- Full authority allow provinces more responsible
↳ accountability } specific set of needs
↳ incentives

Second Proposition

- 10 provinces will be affected
- refutation → breakdown in province-relationship
↳ premier wants to get elected
- POT → Alberta? → world is shifting towards green initiatives
- Indigenous people → ind. gov have leverage to help them more
- different economic needs

Judge's Comments: clash Arguments overall
First Opposition

- 1- each province is unique → same goals
Fed is suited to local needs
- 2-
- 3- indigenous people are left
- Ex: Alberta is fighting for lack of regulation
Individual → Indigenous ppl
provincial objective diff. provinces, diff needs/ values
int provinces will not cooperate with each other
↳ lead to clashes?
env. applies to everyone
lead up to national goals

Second Opposition

- the environment is fluid
- clash → freedom to raise climate change issues
↳ clashes regarding these issues
- Indigenous ppl will not be consulted
they are the first to be impacted (climate change affects them the most)
- less time, less money is put in when Fed gov is involved

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Di Giorgio

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Poet Caehoe

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Billy Killyard

Kandice Biddulph

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>74</u> |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Helen Pan

Emily J.

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>80</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>77</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>150</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>157</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Intro was a bit lengthy for a 6 min speech
Well modelled

Second Proposition

Try to give more POIs
Impact your points
good analysis w/o consequence

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good examples w/ Alberta

Second Opposition

Try to rebut and not defend

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Max Schiller

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 7

Room: M325

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Rivieres

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ty Deutscher Elliot Costa

Puneet Chhina

Anisha Biswas

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

152

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

155

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Clear Model
- Learn County hard to Manage across the County
- Diff that was between each province
- good examples
- good Response to POI that wasn't understood
- Second POI Response was good. Just took a second
- Build down? Make Clear things, good Structure. Sort needs to be more clear
- Jobs (same point)
- Almost the same as the first point
- Economically based

Second Proposition

- Retortation: - Sh
- Important: Should have been in the first speech
- It would be better to deal with the legislative examples as something that could happen to Environment
- Agency
- good point by talking briefly about how the bid... is too slow
- good example of how Q1 and Q2 were ahead of the game
- smaller countries are better at managing than big ones?

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Federalism
- Idea of how it's important for federal gov to play a role
- Climate Change issue
- good use of gov's examples against them
- Response to POI was good
- Build down?
- maybe mention the points that with Alberta helping their own sector
- Prop made more than take them down rather than solely focusing

Second Opposition

- Retortation
- good talking the burden of how blanket solutions may work here
- good: pointing out how much of how cannot be done w/o. Environment
- good ref to Sovereignty
- Businesses will move to less regulated areas
- good point
- good bring it back to jobs

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matthew Schmeiser

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M325

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Rivière

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ty Deutscher

Elliot Costa

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Pooet Chhina

Anisha Bhowas

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>77</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>78</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>152</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>155</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Both teams' most substantive argument wound up being the issue of economic impact. Opp did a better job of explaining the mechanism by which Federalism was more fair to the provinces by offering an even playing field, while Prop failed to provide sufficient reason why provinces would be equally incentivized to act.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Both teams' most substantive argument wound up being the issue of economic impact. Opp did a better job of explaining the mechanism by which Federalism was more fair to the provinces by offering an even playing field, while Prop failed to provide sufficient reason why provinces would be equally incentivized to act.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christine Lang

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: M325

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Rivière

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ty

Elliot

Puneet

Anisha

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>75</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>75</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>77</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>79</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>150</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>156</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Scope of debate was too narrow; only addressed the carbon tax
- speech was well organised
- good volume + good eye contact
- not always able to address POIs sufficiently
- no model presented
- good job offering + accepting POIs

- counter model was collaborative
- speaks much too quickly to be well understood
- great content but it's easy to miss
- watch your language; "screwing over"
- manage your time

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

- started slow, but became easier to understand
- a lot of repetition of contentions from 1st prop

- Excellent clash + sign posting
- your speech was clear and easy to follow
- very clear speaking style
- great job

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Carissa Balcaen

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: M 246

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rooyu Noranda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony Hu

Hugo Hu.

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Croix

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cameron O' Hare

Claudia Leroux

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

159

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

154

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good key final statement that the opp is advocating for the status quo, essentially by sharing the responsibility.
- How does Canada benefit from not opposing the federal government?

Second Proposition

- In style, try to add pauses between your ideas.
- Very good example of how Cap + Trade failed in the US.
- How do policies already in place have the potential to solve the "long term problem"?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Avoid a slippery slope refutation. (end of the world)
- Very nice themes in final rebuttal
- Argument on International Effect was valid, but enforce this through a POI against the "worst disruption"
- Why does international presence triumph of owning of resources in C92A?

Second Opposition

- Good job of shutting down numerous POI's.
- How does the short term effect on the economy get saved over time? Explain this for the point to be valid at the end of

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Yasmeen Dajani

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lacolle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zahra Slutchuk Anna Koplovith

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Berthierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Petra Planden Hana Sereda.

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| | |
|------------|-----|
| Team Score | 149 |
| | 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| | |
|------------|-----|
| Team Score | 160 |
| | 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Good structure, & good job bringing environment to the forefront
- Need more analysis in constructive.

Second Proposition

- Too little analysis in refutation, but good structure and analysis of constructive.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Great analysis & use of examples.
- A little ~~less clear~~ ^{less clear} in the rebuttal, but great style otherwise

Second Opposition

- Excellent analysis of constructive, but spend more time on ~~rebuttal~~ refutation.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Surry

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: La Colle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zahra Slutchuk

Ann Kaplovich

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 71 71 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Berthierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Petra Plandon

Hanna Sereda

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 80 80 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 145 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 156 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good speaking style
- more analysis
- try not to add too much
- rebut. in wind down
- more weighing

Second Proposition

- more in depth refutation
- more clash
- good constructive

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- tell me why your points are important
- don't be flustered, you did great
- good analysis

- more mechanisms
- try to clash better with key ideas

Second Opposition

- very upbeat
- good refutation
- beware of arguments that are too similar to first speaker, it was almost

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mita Bhattacharya

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

La colle

Team Name: Providence take control

First Speaker:

Zahra S.

Second Speaker:

Anna Kaproski
Sancala P.

OPPOSITION

Berthierille

Team Name: Providence take control

First Speaker:

Petra Pantak

Second Speaker:

Anna Samira

| Score |
|---------------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|---------------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|---------------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|---------------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|----------------|
| 150 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|----------------|
| 150 |
| 200 |

| |
|----------------|
| 160 |
| 160 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

+ structure
Great style, but pls link in mechanization
↳ elaborate on why the provincial govt should not be taken away ⇒ is this an absolute right?

Second Proposition

↳ detail the logic
why is that opposition repaired?
Great structure!
Again write in mechanization
↳ why should be specific
"other things" ⇒ what did you mean? Be specific.
- good minimization
but if the environment is so important, how does provincial support this?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great use of evidence! Clear style ⇒ great structure.
- Develop points ⇒ + great rebuttal!
It would be useful, if your arguments were in order of priority - national interest
- move your evidence as the principle sometimes got in way of the overall principle you needed to establish

Second Opposition

Great confidence!
"couldn't be dealt w/ at prov level, but why?"
"would be illogical" - why is it better for Fed to do this?
- instead the nation of economic incentives.
- the Fed mechanism
Link your points up front ⇒ evidence & rebuttal

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Daniel Mendelson.

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: H 244

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Beauceville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lachlan van Eymond

Pahul Singh.

| Score |
|-------|
| 77 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Logan

Jesse Liu.

| Score |
|-------|
| 81 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 77 77 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 151 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 156 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good sp. style
- Roadmap → Point titles.
- Ask How? How will what you are saying actually happen?
- Set up status Quo, what is it like now.

Second Proposition

- Roadmap, point titles.
- Don't summarize without refutation.
- More logic, less facts/stats unless you are using to
- Separate

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Don't hyperbolize.
- Point titles.
- Summary rebuttal shouldn't be a point of yours; make it broader.

Second Opposition

- Don't bring in questions.
- Bring constructive ~~later~~ sooner
- Separate constructive & refutation.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CHLOE SHAHNIAN

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M244

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Beauceville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lachlan van Egmond

Pahul Singh

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Logan

Jesse Liu

| Score |
|-------|
| 82 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

154

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

160

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

→ Focus on mechanizing your constructive case by ensuring that your argumentation is mutually exclusive

Second Proposition

→ Engage in more refutation of the opposition
→ Focus on their strongest points

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

→ Could have developed your analysis on accountability and voter agency

Second Opposition

→ Make sure that you refute the strongest material from govt.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M244

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Beauverville

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Lachlan van Egmond

Pahul Singh

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>81</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>80</u> |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Alex

Jesse

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>82</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>80</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>161</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>162</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Mechanize arguments better
- Good use of evidence
- Build down could be better organized

Second Proposition

- Could signpost a bit more
- More systemic refutation
- Strong constructive

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great overall speech
- A bit hyperbolic
- 2nd constructive argument from Prop 2 needed more refutation

Second Opposition

- More clash ~~at~~ needed (focused on rebuild)
- Strong constructive → well analyzed

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: G. Louden.

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1 Room: _____

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Amos.

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Joliette.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kuan Zhang

Nazar Viznytsya

Livia ION

JULIA WANG

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>75</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>74</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>73</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>72</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>149</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>145</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Greg OPP won

OPP=Amos.

comments given in round.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Arbalar Ghaemi

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: 226

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

Team Name: Joliette

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia Ion

Julia Wang

Kuan Zhang

Nazar Vasylysa

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 71 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 73 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 71 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 1415 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 1441 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Andrew Vanderbussche

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: M326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia Ion

Julia Wang

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Joliette

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kuan Zhang

Nazar Viznytsya

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 147 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 150 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Clear organization & flow
- Example contingent case
- ↳ Are the examples outdated?
- ↳ What are the overarching themes?
- Reply speech needed more engagement

A lot of assertions

Second Proposition

- Too similar to 1st Prop
- Don't refute w/ examples
- Spoke well

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- More general overarching themes
- Constitution point needs more development
- A few assertions made

Second Opposition

- Framing more w/ unity was good
- SNC Lavalin example supported Prop's case

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MUIR

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: M336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Cowansville

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Maya Mior

Natasha Viegas

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Remi

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Alex Laurin

Sake Sunny

| Score |
|-----------|
| <u>75</u> |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-----------|
| <u>73</u> |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-----------|
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-----------|
| <u>73</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| <u>148</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| <u>49</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Fulfilled roles
Try to present more general arguments before going into specific case study.
Summary limit to 20 per 3min
List BOTH Q's before going into detail

Second Proposition

Good Road map ✓
No need to "rebuild" points not refuted. Just highlight lack of refutation
Some points seem to be presented back to front (supporting Op.)

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Please Roadmap
try to complete your reasoning early before going into specific detail or taking POI.
More refutation required
good arguments

Second Opposition

good arguments, poor org.
Please road map
separate constructive from refutation
Don't move so much

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nicholas Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A209

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sherbrooke

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Adriano Morehouse

Liam Leduc-Boyle

| Score |
|------------------|
| 74 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 72 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Les Coteaux

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Mariya Syed

Gregoria Ginakes

| Score |
|------------------|
| 74 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 76 76 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

146

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

~~150~~

150

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Nice, brief model & initial stance
- Main arguments were addressed & fleshed out
- Offer more POIs, so you have opportunity to offer clash
- Since it is a prepared topic, be sure to provide tangible evidence to support case.

Second Proposition

- Interesting constructive argument
- Good POI: BC & Alberta ✓✓
- Point about coercion seemed to clash

w/ stance of "only provinces making decisions"

↳ should be clear from the get-go

• Practice time - splits:

50/50?
 ↓
 unable to refute/...

great involvement w/ POIs

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Engaging speaker with compelling intros & conclusions.
- Good response regarding risks of provinces doing nothing.
- 1st point had logical analysis.
- Needs to offer more analysis in refutation & more clash & avoid repetition.
- Since it's a prepared topic, try offering more eye contact & examples
- Be sure to answer POI if you say you'll respond later.

Second Opposition

- Great exp. of England
- Interesting constructive arguments
- Use of analogy was effective
- Good clarification that Feds. may make decisions that may be UNIDEAL for some provinces ✓✓
- Use of more examples from Canada will further strengthen case
- try offering more POIs

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Liz Stratton

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: A209

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sherbrooke

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Adriano Marchese Liam Leduc-Bye

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Les Coteaux

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Marya Syed

Gregoria Girakes

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 149 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 153 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- strong opening quote & sense of urgency
- relevant arguments
- examples or references to current events or research would make points even stronger
- good twist on opp's points about going slowly

Second Proposition
Opposition

- excellent opening example from UK to illustrate danger of leaving environ
- mental policies to local govt.
- some points of refutation were less clear

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- dynamic speaker - compelling intro. & conclusion
- great use of quotes & explanations.
- specific examples would ~~help~~ strengthen your arguments even further

Proposition
Second Opposition

- good PDI & response to opponent's question.
- idea of enshrining right to clean environment in charter is very interesting, but it seemed like a big change from your partner's ease
- constitutional changes require provincial assent

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julia Abundo

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A 209

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sherbrooke

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Adriano Morehouse Liam Leduc-Bayle

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Les Coteaux

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Marya Syed Gregoria Ginakes

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| 148 |
|-----|
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| 149 |
|-----|
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Try to make your model as clear as possible. If needed a little more development
- Loved the themes in your conclusion speech, very well organized

Second Proposition

- Your constructive was very clear and well laid out, very easy to follow and understand.
- Make sure to have to model completely out in the first speech instead of adding to it in the 3rd speech of the round.
- Your time split could use some work, but your road-mapping was great

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Make sure you explain your quotes and examples even if they seem self-explanatory to you. You selected some great examples but just needed to explain a little bit more about why they mattered.
- Wonderful style, very entertaining and interesting to listen to!

Second Opposition

- Your starting quote/example was excellent!
- Very well laid out and split speech, make sure your points are super clear!
- Love the passion, just make extra certain that you're attacking the argument and not the opponents themselves.

Motion:

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Victoria Kalisky

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A306

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Magog

Team Name: Portneuf

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Anais Lewis

Julia Reimer

Nora McLenna

Jake Waldner

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 72 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 77 78 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

147

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

156

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- requires greater research and analysis of concepts related to topic (ie. federalism)
- requires examples and discussion of legislative
- related impact analysis.
- Poll!
- good job!

Second Proposition

- refer to first speaker's comments
- Poll!
- good job!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- requires more examples
- good luck!

Second Opposition

- ~~good~~ good roadmap
- requires examples to impact-argument
- good luck!

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lauren Kim

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A306

PROPOSITION

Team Name: magog

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anais Lewis

Julia Reimer

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Portneuf

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nora McLennan

Jake Waldner

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----------------------|
| 148 148 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 158 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good characterization
- but need mechanization of analysis
- avoid repetition in argumentation
- time management
- need - more time for 2nd point
- themes for buildown

Second Proposition

- good analysis of argument
 - need more refutation
 - not enough clash
 - more organization
 - explicit rebuilding
- } opportunity for gov. side to engage!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- fantastic organization - good job 😊
- good analysis
- need to take on comparative
- why your side achieves goal both sides are trying to tackle
- time management (careful to ~~spend~~ leave enough time for constructive)

Second Opposition

- don't read introduction
- good engagement
- organize speech better (need signposting)
- good ~~to point~~ job at pointing out what gov. failed to do

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: #1 BUTHRIE

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: 306

PROPOSITION

Team Name: MAGOG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ANNAIS LEWIS

JULIA REIMER

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: PORTNEUF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

NDRA MCLENNAN

JAKE WALDER

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 148 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 156 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Improve organization at outset.
Good point that locally established
law is more readily followed. Pointe
this!
Improve organization. Get to ground level
argument sooner.
Give better factual evidence.

Second Proposition

Develop your refutation in more
length and depth -
Try to explain arguments more simply
and concisely -

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Strong manner, tone.
Some good refutation. Pointe refutation
further.

Try to sum up earlier.

Improve factual evidence.

Make POIs sharper -

Try to use full time in Rebuttal -

Second Opposition

Thoughtful, quite well organized.
Key it simple. Pointe simply
why the bill won't work.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: DAN ELBLING

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: M240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SHAWINIGAN

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Philippe D

Annabelle K

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 76 |
| 100 |

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 75 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: HUDSON

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

PENELOPE C

MONTSERAT A.

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 81 |
| 100 |

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 78 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 151 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 159 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- You organized your 1st speech really well
- Remember to keep in mind the "comparative" ... here, that in the status quo, press can already pass legislation which is good for them.

Second Proposition

- You did a great job of refuting. You went point by point & you were very thorough.
- In a prepared round, you would be better off using actual evidence.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- very well organized speech
- if you can provide more than 1 reason why an actor might do something, it's easier to believe. Ex: simply being part of the Paris agreement is not a super

Second Opposition

- very thorough and complete refutation
- Your constructive was very similar to your partner's points & could have used a bit more organization

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Glenda Stoneman

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: 240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Shawinigan

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Philippine Delaby Annabelle Kollmar

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 75 |
| 100 |

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 76 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Penelope Cholakis Montserrat Alvarez

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 80 |
| 100 |

| |
|-------|
| Score |
| 79 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 151 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 159 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

You had good ideas. Some further organization of your thoughts was needed. At times you repeated similar ideas and caused some time issues.

Good listening through the debate allowed an effective summary.

Second Proposition

Do take a POI if you can - you did eventually! 😊

I think that your analogies were distracting - it might have been helpful to use actual facts for the case.

Your ideas were good and your structure clear.

Use the full time

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Nice structure. Good refutations and nice layout of your arguments. Good facts and evidence to support your arguments.

At times some reading of notes reduced eye contact + engagement.

You used gov't's arguments effectively against them in your whip speech.

Second Opposition

You had nice evidence and examples. It was clear that your research and preparation was strong.

You handled POI well.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alysha Zackon

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Shawinigan

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Philipine Delaby

Annabelle Kolman

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Penelope Cholakis

Montserrat Alvarez

| Score |
|-------|
| 82 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 151 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 162 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

You did a great job listening to the arguments brought up by the other side and adequately refuted them. You have great things to say, slow down and we can all take them in!
Excellent first round!

Second Proposition

Very strong knowledge of content. Great job listening and refuting. When the floor is yours, take your time - you have great things that should be heard!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great organization of arguments
 - Adequately refuted prop's arguments.
 - Relevant points brought up.
- Well done!
- Great tone + delivery.

Second Opposition

You made very strong arguments.
Well done!
- Great tone + delivery

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nick Morrow

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M32a

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Maskinonge

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Evan Laurence

Charlie Simm

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 77 77 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Hyacinthe

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yuran Wang

Penelope Siozos

| Score |
|------------------|
| 74 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

151

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

149

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

-time split: 5 min point 1
1 min point 2

↳ more examples would have made it clear

Second Proposition

→ case tension
↳ do we care what's best for province or all of Canada???

→ Good engagement and touching all of opp's case

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Similar cons-
3 ³⁰ ~~1~~ ⁵⁰ ~~2~~ ref - unfair need to give more rebuildy
↳ also not thorough ref

→ uniformity point was strong however explain log safety impact

Second Opposition

↳ lack of engagement with first speaker's points
↳ unresponded to
↳ talked fast (too)

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Desmond Viegar

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M 329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Maskonongé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Evan Laurence

Charlie Simms

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Hyacinthe

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yuran Wang

Penelope Sizel

| Score |
|------------------|
| 72 72 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 74 74 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 148 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|--------------------|
| 145 145 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good 1st point → different geographies in provinces
- 2nd point only began at 5:25, so not as well developed
- did not ask any POI's
- effective summary

Second Proposition

- good 2nd point re: Environmentalism is trans-Carada
- good refutation point → "uniform solution not effective if the uniform does not fit"
- ↳ strong engagement in general

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good constructive points
 - uniformity
 - intergovernmental relations
- refutation only began at 5:30, and was therefore limited (only 30 seconds)
- Summary - effective closing

Second Opposition

- good point re: Carada will have more legitimacy when signing international accord
- good example about Great Lakes (2 pmms)
- delivery - a bit fast

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Miranda Collett

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Maskinagé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Evan Laurence

Charlie Simm

| |
|------------------|
| Score |
| 71 73 |
| 100 |

| |
|------------------|
| Score |
| 70 72 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Hyacinthe

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yurdan Wang

Penelope Sizos

| |
|------------------|
| Score |
| 72 73 |
| 100 |

| |
|------------------|
| Score |
| 73 74 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>145</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>147</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- highlighting provincial diff. Good!
- Make sure to analyze why provinces are likely to pass leg. that is effective & impactful don't just assert that they will

Second Proposition

- Good clash!
- Careful with having constructive that assumes

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Uniformity & collective action Good!
- Don't forget to do rebuttal / clash

Second Opposition

- Good clash!
- remember to tell me why your point has impacts that matter in the round.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CHRISTIANS

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Farnham ~~dist~~

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

~~Jack~~ Ethan Chan

Jack Berry

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>72</u> |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Justine

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amanda Sultan

Alexa Richstone

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>80</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>81</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>150</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>161</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

themes of power, control and ownership ~~not~~ needed additional evidence and support

Second Proposition

additional refutation with evidence would have strengthened the argument.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

laid out the international aspects well; good refutation, additional evidence would have strengthened the argument.

Second Opposition

good job adding substance and evidence. Expansion of the global impacts (air) would have strengthened the case.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michelle Murphy

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: 328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: FAKNHAM

First Speaker:

Ethan Chan

Second Speaker:

Jack Barry

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St JUSTINE

First Speaker:

Amanda Sultar

Second Speaker:

Alexe Richstone

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>75</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>72</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>79</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>79</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>147</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>158</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

*clear and calm
thoughtful
try not to be repetative*

Second Proposition

*summary was a bit weak
work on organization*

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

*so much to say but
slow down
some excellent points*

Second Opposition

*work on conclusion
more specific
evidence*

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ANDREW KAPLAN

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: FARNHAM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chan

Jack Berry

| Score |
|-------|
| 77 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SAINTE JUSTINE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amanda Saltin

Alexa Richstone

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

151

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

well articulated, needed to organize your clash a little better.

Second Proposition

good support of partner & reasonable point. Needed more evidence and more clash.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Strong speaker good clash. Needed more evidence in points

Second Opposition

Strong speaker, well articulated strong evidence. Need to expand more.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Akil Allegne

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 1 Room: M342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint-Sulpice

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Matthew Horna Sasha Klein

| Score |
|------------------|
| 79 79 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 81 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Montréal

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Thane Morgan William Alhem

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 81 81 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 160 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 159 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Proposition - Try speaking a bit more slowly

- Remember to road-map both your & your partner's constructive arguments @ the start of your speech.
- Good confidence, poise, & articulation
- Try to avoid saying "We believe that" - just state the point without preamble.
- Good summary - esp. pointing out arguments of yours that your opponents failed to refute.

Second Proposition

- Very confident & well-spoken presentation!
- Remember to road-map your speech up front - eg. will you refute first & construct later, or vice versa?
- Good points about less environmental or climatic variation within provinces than across the whole country & about provincial gov't's being closer to the people!

Judge's Comments: First Opposition - Very good intro

- Good rebuttals - but try & cite a source or 2 when making a factual claim, like what you said about Nova Scotia's health care system
- Nice obs'v' re: how resource-driven Canada's economy is - BUT be careful not to overstate the point. Canada's economy isn't exclusively dependent on resource extraction.
- Good job taking POIs!
- Good summary speech - BUT fill up your time!

Second Opposition - Very good intro & road map!

- Very good signposting (i.e. transitions between arguments)!
- Good job illustrating one of your points by stating that you can see a black cloud over part of Alberta from the space due to the tar sands!
- *ALL 4 SPEAKERS*: some reference to Canada's contribution & the jurisdictions it lays out would have been very helpful!

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matthew Anzareth

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rigaud

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Michael Chen Jasma Zhou

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>75</u> |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Thetford Mines

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Rafay Ahmed Dishita Emaya Varanban

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>78</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>76</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>151</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|------------|
| <u>154</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good style and clarity. - good examples
- watch out with impacts or argumentation that are not uniquely achieved by your policy. (i.e. provincial governments are elected by people"
- watch out for arguments that are not fully impacted (i.e. argument on "pushback in provinces" or "provinces shutting out broadcast")

Second Proposition

- Same comment as 1st speaker (explain why impacts are unique to your side). - i.e. "governments change all the time".

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Effective refutation
 - > demonstrating that some issues were out. (fed govt is also elected)
 - > use of stance (shared jurisdiction) to co-opt prop's benefits.
 - > some responses were only examples though and could have gone further.
- generally good arguments and examples.

Second Opposition

- Be sure to explain why provinces can't sign onto international agreements.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Edward Lai

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rigaud

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Michael Chen

Jasma Zhou

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>73</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>73</u> |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Thetford Mines

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Rafay Ahmed

Dishita E.

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>75</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>74</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>146</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>149</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Great ~~is~~ style. Very confident delivery
- Logic was hard to follow. Most of your case hinged on the argument that provincial governments better represent the people, but this assertion was never proven.

Second Proposition

- Very confident style as well.
- Case relied on same unproven logic as Prop 1.
- Time management can be improved.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good job refuting Prop 1's argument (see Prop 1 comments)
- More time could have been devoted to deconstructing that argument, since Prop's entire case hinged on it.
- Time management can be improved.

Second Opposition

- Good refutation.
- Nervousness showed, but content was effectively delivered nonetheless.
- Time management can be improved.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sebastian Lopez

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rigaud

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Chen

Jasma Zhou

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Thetford Mines

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rafay Ahmed

Dshita Emoyaversonban

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 147 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 148 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- didn't state motion at the beginning
- speaking style was good
- In the boil down, more needed to be done to clarify existing ~~states~~ states of Prop.

Second Proposition

- Good speaking style
- needed more refutation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- your arguments needed more warranting, just relied solely on examples & precedent.

Second Opposition

- make sure to attack the strongest points of Prop.
- Time management

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Riley Cohen

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: A220

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Drummondville

Team Name: Rawdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Li

Jonathon chu

Rally Lin

Alastair thornburn

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 81 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

158

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

160

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- ~~Good~~ Good speech, but make sure to bring up the exact wording of the motion
- I liked your rebuttal

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good Refutation, but try to be more organized about it
- I liked your point about lobbying, but it got lost in the debate. Maybe bring it back in

Second Proposition

- make sure your examples, like measles, don't come back to hurt you
- Great refutation

Second Opposition

- Refrain from reading your notes while you speak
- I liked your indigenous point, but flesh it out more

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Robinson

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: 220

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Drummondville

Team Name: Rawden

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Eric Li

Jonathan Chu

Rally Lin

Alastair Thorburn-Vitols

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 87 83 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 160 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 161 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Well organized
- > great eye contact
- > ~~very~~ good use of voice, - would be even better if not as loud
- > have a longer conclusion
- > Well organized rebuttal but include ^{points} ^{points} ^{write}

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- > good attacks
- > very good delivery
- > well ~~so~~ organized
- > have a longer conclusion
- > well organized rebuttal ~~but~~

Second Proposition

- Great intro
- very good delivery
- good point about dif. provinces having dif needs
- > ^{sub.} try to leave enough time for a conclusion that boils down the debate

Second Opposition

- good attacks
- good arguments - try to be less tied to your notes
- > good use of voice
- > explain reasoning in even greater depth
- > watch the time

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Massimo Di Lullo

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: A220

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Drummondville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Li

Jonathan Chu

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>79</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>78</u> |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rawdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rally Lin

Alastair Thorburn-Vitelo

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>82</u> |
| 100 |

| |
|-----------|
| Score |
| <u>80</u> |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>157</u> |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>162</u> |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Flesh out Arguments more
- Choose Examples more carefully
- Summary Speech: Reference Partners Contentions

Second Proposition

- Organization
- Less content more refutation
- Watch for contradictions

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Flesh arguments out more
- Rebuttal Speech: Prioritize Content over Intro
- ↳ reference Partners Contentions

Second Opposition

- Time management
- Point shouldn't be too important
- Refute all of 1st prop points
- Avoid repeating 1st app responses

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Manuel Wiltzer

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: M 242

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Pimouski

Team Name: Pierreville

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Aehan Chiang Edward Yang

Hally Jamieson Lydney Carvathors

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 72 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 72 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 148 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 144 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

good evidence for federal relations
 points were well defined and unique
 - make sure that you explain why your point is right or the most probable outcome.
 - asking yourself why you are right is a good way to come up with analysis. when you can't ask why anymore, you are deep enough
 - Bad down speeches are very effective if you can find themes that came out in the debate and then how you won

Second Proposition

- you made a good point about federal overreach causing separatism. an example like Quebec would have been good.
 - even if the other side gives bad points, don't let that make yourself is less refutation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- you had a good outline
 - your points got mushed together and were hard to distinguish
 - make sure when you refute, you refute individual points by explaining why your points still stand.

Second Opposition

- Don't forget to bring down the Debate in the final speech
 - make sure you fully develop your points
 - For example can't the Fed also make bad choices?
 - you focused on image on the world stage, but don't forget you are beholdin to voters, so wouldn't that matter more?
 - Refutation needs to be more than saying the other side ~~isn't~~ didn't enjoy enough.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Thebaud-Harris

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M242

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chikig Edward Yung

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Pierreville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Holly Jameson Cydney Corrothers

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

149

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

147

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good form; needs more impacts & links to the motion.

Second Proposition

- First argument wasn't clear.
- Good rebutting

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good first argument.
↳ Refutation could be more in-depth.

Second Opposition

Good 2nd, 3rd arguments; should have been first.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christina Orlando

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M242

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chiary

Edward Hang

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Pierreville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Holly Jamieson

Cydney Corcher?

| Score |
|-------|
| 71 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 149 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 144 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good intro
- good first point
- 2nd pt, subpoint on transit a bit confusing
- more elaboration on your ~~good~~ first point would be good
- maybe dive deeper into your examples
- more mechanism needed of why it would be ineffective
- more analysis in refutation needed
- good speaking style

Side point could have focused more on the positives for province having more control instead of just the negatives.

less reading of points away of points

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- An intro would be helpful
- Why won't the province be able to achieve it?
- careful when you say you need more analysis, take them at their best

Second Opposition

- An intro could be good.
- The first speaker should take the majority of the points.
- your points had good explanations behind them.

give points

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jarren Fefer

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M237

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Belseil

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Félicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christina Liu

Hana Aref Toher

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 81 83 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 150 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 163 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Feed back given in round

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keith Mousa

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M237

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Beloei

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christina Liu

Hana Aret Taher

| Score |
|-------|
| 78 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|------------------|
| 75 75 |
| 100 |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Felicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zheng

| Score |
|-------|
| 82 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

153

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

161

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Intro contains examples to drive point (good)
- Solid and thorough definitions
- Clear roadmap
- Stuttering here and there
- Clear signposting
- Easy to follow logic
- Good filling of time

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Engaging and relevant analogy intro No POIs given
- Speaks a little too quickly... → slows down later
- Maintains good eye contact
- May need more varied examples (ex: What other priorities does a prov go have?)
- Refutation not clearly synthesized

Boil Down:

- Clear and get - Unclear themes
 - Remainder of model → should've emphasized opp's failure to address model
- Second Proposition**
- Reading a little too much
 - Not real signposting for refutation
 - ~~Constructive well analyzed~~
 - Signposting in general was weak
 - Constructive well analyzed
- No POIs given
- Tilgout filled well as a language*

Boil Down

- Clear and relevant themes
 - Great emphasis on balance of practices
 - Emphasis on Prop's failures
- Very good overall
- How ever: Prop's model not addressed here*
- Second Opposition**
- Very good roadmap
 - Very good speaker
 - Great analysis on Alberta's situation in this debate
 - Professionalism can be improved...
 - Relevant examples brought forth
 - No clear constants
 - Does not leave much time for constructive at all
- is 20 secs?*

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isaac Bellum

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: 9M237

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Baloei

Team Name: Saint Felicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christina Liu

Hana Alet Taher

Andre Le

Paul Zhang

| Score |
|-------|
| 77 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 152 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

| |
|-----|
| 160 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: PATRICIA DONNELLY

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 1 Room: 343

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Jerome

Team Name: Ville Marie

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Talia Trottenberg Mia Su

Huda Abdelkerm Fatima Anees

| Score |
|-------|
| 76 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|----------|
| 77 PA 77 |
| 100 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79 |
| 100 |

Please consider: Content, Argumentation, Analysis, Organization, Presentation, Refutation and Rebuttal, Points of Information

| |
|----------------|
| Team Score |
| 151 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

| |
|----------------|
| Team Score |
| 156 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION // OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Clearly organized speech
- Some, but not sufficient specific examples
- Strong point about vastness of Canada & the variety of environmental issue from prov. to prov.

Boil down - mainly a summary for needed to answer the opposition.

- First Nations point not strong - not sufficient evidence to support this as a reason for full prov. control
- The limits of prov/fed jurisdiction were not clearly outlined - so question in the resolution was not answered.

Very good ^{sets up of} point by point ~~rebuttal~~ speech structure

- Strong refutation
- National obligations of Canada on environment at international stage is an important point
- problem of limited prov. resources also imp't

Boil down: You effectively rebutted main contentions of proposition

Second Opposition
• Very good point by point rebuttal.

You addressed the fed. commitments that would make fed. control of environment beneficial effectively.
STRONG SPEECH.