

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CHRISTIANS

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: 339

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Remi

Team Name: Mont Laurier

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Laurin Jake Surry

Ashton McNamara Danica Scully

Score
78
100

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Score
78
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
154
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Strong rebuttal speech & summation
the issue of which level of gov should decide how to handle issues that cross jurisdictions requires more direct confrontation/explanation

Second Proposition

excellent points on focus & proximity. The idea of localized expertise is a sophisticated argument.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

additional refutation would have assisted the argument, especially w/ respect to the cod & Cannabis ~~arg~~ examples; support for interjurisdictional impacts needed.

Second Opposition

dealt well with POs especially EU point. the national reputation point was fine but could have been strengthened with more evidence.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jacqueline Belzberg

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: M339

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Remi

Team Name: Mont Laurier

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Laurin

Jake Surry

Ashton McNamara

Danira Scully

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

Score
75
100

Score
77
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

152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Overall great speech. Model could use a little more details and explanation. Solid case split and good provincial population analysis. Try to explain the cod example more!

Great summary! very well done 😊

Second Proposition

Very well done argument. Slow down a touch. Solid rebuttal.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Overall solid job. Make sure to keep an eye on your time splits so that you don't run out of time!

The speech was a touch repetitive.

Try to have more analysis in your summary speech, it was very repetitive!

Second Opposition

Expand on pipeline example! Good rebuttal and style overall! Points weren't the most relevant but well explained regardless.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Abigail Truino

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

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Rémi

Team Name: Mount Carmel

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Lamin Fake Sunny

Ashton McNamee Danica Scully

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

Score
76
100

Score
78
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

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Victoria Kalisky

No. of Judges: _____

Round: _____

Room: _____

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Drummondville~~ Saint Hyacinthe

Team Name: Drummondville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker: "LO"

Second Speaker: "MO"

Yuran Wang

Penelope Sizos

Eric Li

Jonathan Cho

Score
80 76
100

Score
80 73
100

Score
80
100

Score
81
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

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good roadmap, definition required detail on legislation
- federalism + cooperation:
 - great analysis. I like that you discuss provincial incentives in terms of the electoral process.
 - Alberta: glad you brought up Kinder-Morgan pipeline to demonstrate local vs national economic interests.

emphasizes democratic process, but needs to impact that and link electoral process on provincial interests with effectiveness

Second Proposition

Whip speech: good style
clash with opp more!

~~power~~ federal relations

~~()~~

power struggle impedes progress, that goal point but it requires examples for impact

Refutation:

~~On economic~~

→ required more examples to be very persuasive. good point.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- * overall strong, very well researched, and strong delivery
- do not heckle please
- ~~counter opposition~~ fed cooperate w provinces with ultimate say...
 - good, clear intro
 - great flow / time management

great rebuttal in speech

Refutation

→ cooperation → efficiency overrides cooperation. goal point, but be careful not to overlook the democratic process!

Principles

federal powers tied to stakes of issue. good argument and analysis of spillover effects

Second Opposition

• do not GREAT REFUTATION!
• you should try not to prepare a written speech in debate

Refutation

• blame game → good rebuttal to MC
• on unity → false assumption that Alberta isn't concerned about policy, they need the most innovative ones.

Right of Provinces

→ show that centralization overrides democratic process, lacks analysis but federal point is VERY strong!!

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Di Giorgio

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: M243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Zachule

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Danae Papelassis Ava Olin

Score
76
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Rivière

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Elliot Costa Ty Deutcher

Score
73
100

Score
72
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
145
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

You need to outline the nuance of your model when creating an incentive structure

Second Proposition

*Try to add new analysis in your reconstruction.
Good rebuttal*

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Try to adopt your arguments to the specific debate not just reword

Second Opposition

Good point! Just spend more time on development

Try not to just state facts. Explain why they are relevant

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Arianna Galbraith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M243

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Peplelassis

Ava Olin

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Trois Rivière

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elliot Coste

Ty Deutscher

Score
73
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score

155

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

146

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- model was a bit lengthy & complicated, try not to do this because it makes the debate about the model, not the ideas.
- great explanations!
- try not to refute w/ an example, you can find an example that goes against any argument, rather attack argument & embellish w/ an example.

Second Proposition

- great refutation.
- when doing rebuttal of partner's points, say: my partner said: " " side opp said: " " in response, and then give your rebuttal or it will get confusing. try not to rebutle partner's points

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- tie your points back to your overall argument. tell us "so this is why etc etc.", "this will affect this etc.". Give us the general reason for your examples.

Second Opposition

- try to attack general ideas, not specific examples.
- the judges will recognize if an unfair burden is placed upon opp. due to a model, so try not to argue the model definition.
- good response to a poi.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ceylan Borgers

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M243

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

Team Name: Trois Rivière

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Repelassis Ava Olin

Elliot Costa Ty Deutscher

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score
157
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
147
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

great public speaking skills

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

bring up more arguments

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michelle Murphy

No. of Judges: _____ Round: 2 Room: A220

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Huntington

Team Name: Napierville

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Aliya Kabani

Rhea Gupta

Max Mitchell

Aidan Eisan

Score
<u>85</u>
100

Score
<u>85</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>160</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>148</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

*nice clear presence, powerful presentation skills, clear organization and indepth argument
be more clear when taking a point to make sure you explain your point*

Second Proposition

*beautiful clear speaking style and pace
clear argument and analysis
well articulated rebuttal and refutation*

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

*work on clarity in your organization
you need to breathe to calm your nerves so your points are more clearly understood
be careful of your "kind like" and phrases "like"*

Second Opposition

*work on being more clear when refuting opposition points
be careful not to be repetative in your speaking
you became stronger near the end - keep that confidence throughout.*

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Liz Stratton

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: A220

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aliya Kabani

Rhea Gupta

Score
86
100

Score
87
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Napierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Max Mitchell

Aidan Eisen

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score

173
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

147
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- comparison to health standards was very persuasive
- strong, clear & delivery, opening & summary
- clear understanding of key issues & excellent research
- logical, thorough analysis
- good POI engagement
- Nunavut POI was a bit unclear & territories wouldn't fall w/in your model

Second Proposition

- excellent opening & framing of debate (think globally, act locally)
- strong refutation & excellent ex. w/ Manitoba
- excellent evidence & research about prov. mechanisms
- ex. about oil tankers seemed in-tension w/ your case

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- strong comparisons w/ other areas of federal jurisdiction (waterways, migratory birds)
- relevant & important arguments, keep developing your analysis

- excellent POI to challenge Prop's oil tanker ex.
- strong summary - try boiling down as well

Second Opposition

- good development of opp. case & new points about fairness & federal responsibilities for territories & w/ Indigenous Peoples
- good job turning the carbon tax example to challenge Prop's favouritism argument
- clearer structure would make points even stronger

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Riley Cohen

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: A220

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Huntington

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alia Kabani

Rhea Gupta

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Napierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Max Mitchell

Aidan A Eisan

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>165</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>150</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- maybe ~~take~~ spend more time on constructive material, & less on the intro.
- Great speech!

Second Proposition

- good speech!
- maybe too many examples

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- be more organized about your refutation

Second Opposition

- Spend less time on constructive

Junior National Debating Championships

M340

Judge's Name: TULIA LEB

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: ~~M346~~

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Joliette

Team Name: Rouyn Noranda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nazar Viznytyga Kuan Zhang

Tony Wu

Hugo Hu

Score
73
100

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

Score
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

157
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

→ ~~Strong~~ strong argument about umbrella cover with good analysis
 → didn't buy the argument that ~~it is important~~ that the federal government helps examples.
 → clear style

Second Proposition

→ O.I. not refute first opp. effectively, only gave examples lacked analysis.
 → points were low-impact
 → spoke clearly and very eloquently

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

→ strong ^{analysis} ~~arguments~~
 → strong refutation
 → good benefit from more organization and structure

Second Opposition

→ strongest analysis for opp.
 → came out in first speech
 → clear, impacted arguments

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jarren Feler

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M3A3

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspé

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Puneet Chhina

Anisha Biswas

Patrick Sheild

Anna Beaudry

Score
72
100

Score
72
100

Score
73
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score

144
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

146
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Comment given in
round

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: PATRICIA DONNELLY

No. of Judges: (2)

Round: 2 Room: M343

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Puneet Chhina Anisha Bhowa

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Patrick Steid

Anna Beaudry

Score
77
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
152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition *Please slow down & don't read a text. Speak for notes!*

*- I think as the opp. say that the debate is about how we solve the environmental problems - so it is about the environment not mainly about the constitution & division of power/fed powers
Boil down did not win the case!*

Second Proposition

*You also speak much too quickly.
good point about the good legis in BC -
carbon tax is a suitable issue to raise*

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition *A fine speech - mainly READ! good voice & pace. If you write a speech, it is better you do not, make sure you don't read. Use bullet points.*

*- good evidence about things the feds have already done with environment.
Boil down contained effective rebuttal.*

Second Opposition

*- memorization of speeches, even when delivery is exceptional (as yours is) doesn't make for the best debating.
- Pan Canadian framework is valid & useful point.*

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keeran MacNeal

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 2

Room: A305

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Montserrat

Penelope

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Farnham

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan

Jack

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
75 <u>74</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>163</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>154</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: Joshua Cohen

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 2

Room: A305

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Montserrat Alvarez Penelope Cholakis

Score
78
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Farnham

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chan Jack Barry

Score
82
100

Score
72
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

154
200

PROPOSITION /

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- I was not a fan of the model
- Make sure you link your arguments back to the motion
- You only had 4:30 of context in a prepared round...

Second Proposition

- Start your constructive
- Make sure your impacts are reasonable and match your analysis
- Make a distinction between premier provinces & Federal Politicians

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Only had 3 min of constructive
- Explain how your side differs from the SQ
- Do themes in your reply

Second Opposition

- Don't write out your speech before hand
- Start with your constructive
- Don't have 2 constructive points in 2nd Opp

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon Bracewell

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: A208

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Berthierville

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Petra Planden

Hanu Sereba

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Magoy

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Anais Lewis

Julia Keimer

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>75</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>151</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Excellent preparation
- Make your arguments have impact

Second Proposition

Work on linking this to why you won

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Define the status quo
- You had a very confused Boil-down. Try to clarify

Second Opposition

Flesh-out your points

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Foster Salpeter

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: A207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Berthierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Petra Planden

Hana Sereda

Score
73
100

Score
72
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Magog

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anais Lewis

Julia Reimer

Score
75
100

Score
73
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

148

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

This was a mostly good and clear PM speech. Motion + model were clear, but no need to define every single word in the motion. 1st point was well flushed out, I would have liked some discussion (perhaps linked to the Constitution + other legislative areas) as to why provinces are well positioned, not just why the feds are not. 2nd point was based on a couple examples, but you need to outline why this was the case/will continue. Didn't fill time, could have used it to do more analysis. Careful not to read!

For the purposes of a clearer and easier to follow speech, I would recommend addressing each of Opp's points individually, with specific reference to them.

Constructive material + examples were interesting, but would have been stronger had you connected it to your partner's material, and the stakes the gov't established.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Needed more time for refutation, and more direct engagement with the PM's points. We got a couple examples about provinces electing less environmentalist gov'ts, but this needed some structural analysis (ie, why is this more likely to happen at provincial level). 1st point was good, I liked the national & intl focus BUT the inter-provincial tension facet needed a mechanism that explains it. Ran out of time on 2nd point, and thus lacked some development.

Second Opposition

The refutation in this speech was largely dependent on the premise that provinces only care about money. While gov. did not attack this strongly, you should have made a comparison: why is the federal gov't any better?

Similar problem with constructive material: why is the federal gov't less likely to focus on the economy?

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Asghar Taqui

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: A207

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Berthierville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Petra Planden

Hana Seeda

Score
73
100

Score
71
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Magog

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anais Lewis

Julia Reimer

Score
75
100

Score
72
100

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

Team Score

144
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

147
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Make sure that when giving constructive arguments and content you relate that content to why exactly your side should win the round
- We needed a clear definition on "full authority"
- There are a lot of examples, but not enough analysis on those examples

Second Proposition

- The constructive point was very unclear at a lot of times during the speech

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Provide clarification on what your partner's points are. Differentiate them.
- Your case could have been more researched for a prepared round

Second Opposition

- Make sure to have a clear point with analysis and researched content
- The point was unclear and seemed repetitive to what your partner stated

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lauren Kim

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M237

PROPOSITION

Team Name: thetford Mines

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dishita Emayaramban

Rafay Ahmed

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chiang

Edward Yang

Score
79
100

Score
76
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

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isaac Betham

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: 9m237

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Disha + Anjanika~~ The Lord of Mines

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Disha

Katay

Score
74
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Khmer Si

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan

Edward

Score
79
100

Score
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

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keith Mousa

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: 237

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Thetford Mines

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dishita Emayaraman Rafay Akmal

Score
73
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Remouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chiang Edward Yang

Score
78
100

Score
76
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
15A
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Reads quite a bit
- Trouble responding to POI
- well analysed ^{content} ~~content~~ hindered by ^{nerve} ~~lack of~~ ^{of} ~~speaking flow~~
- Both points amount to similar ^{result} ~~place~~ and message

Boil Down: - Great roadmap
↳ doesn't follow through on it

Second Proposition

- Good impact given
- Points very well structured and flow excellently ^{both}
- Refutation of ~~the~~ points ^{don't} ~~don't~~ directly clash...

Both sides leave POIs hanging

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Nice ~~way~~ ^{manner} of speech
- Reading → Otherwise good public speaking skills
- Great signposting
- 30 secs for refutation
↳ Thorough for what's there

No POIs given

Boil Down: - Themes are ^{or questions} ~~unclear~~ or very unclear
↳ seems to be a string of refutation

Second Opposition

- Good points, insufficient impact at times
- Very good responses to POIs
- Overall needs more impact on everything, not just some aspects of points, but content was going somewhere!

indefinitely...
↳ or for a while...

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alysha Zackon

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Girandy

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lily Rich

Kendall Barnes

Score
78
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Vareennes

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sahasra Bhowmik Lucas Tarry

Score
79
100

Score
77
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

150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

You are a very strong speaker and delivered your speech with confidence and poise

Second Proposition

You have a clear passion for debate! You were well organized and used your time well.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- You did a great job listening + responding to the prop. You are very well spoken and clearly comfortable with the content. Good body language and eye contact. Relevant use of POI's. Good use of your time.

Second Opposition

You are a passionate speaker, which is great to see! You are also clearly comfortable and familiar with your content. Excellent eye contact + body language. My only recommendation is to keep an eye on the time to ensure you can make your rebuttal.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Glenda Stoneman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: 240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Grandby

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lily Rich

Kendall Barnes

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Valanes

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sahasro Bhowmik

Lucas Tarry

Score
78
100

Score
76
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

154

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Definitions very clear and well-thought out.
- The case was a little narrow.
- Your summary speech showed good thinking skills and the ability to respond to the opp's side.

Second Proposition

Good listening to refute opp's points.

You prepared well, although case was narrow; focusing only on carbon tax.

Your speaking style is very clear, interesting and nicely paced.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- You handled the gov't case well and took it at it's best - good debating
- Clear speaking style. Nice organization.
- Good use of debating terminology.
- Perhaps more refutation.
- Questions (Pol's) need to be questions to the other side.

Second Opposition

You speak clearly and at a good pace.

It is clear that you researched your ideas well.

Refutations were left to last 30 seconds, perhaps give more time.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: DAN ELBLING

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: 240

PROPOSITION

Team Name: GRANBY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lily Rich

Kendall Barber

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: VARENNES

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sahasro Bhownik

L. Tarry

Score
78
100

Score
76
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

154
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- You spoke very clearly & passionately
- Timing-wise, you ran out of enough time to finish your 2nd part

Second Proposition

remember to connect your major points to the motion.
Ex: when discussing the different industries in different provinces, why would exclusive legislative power help that?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- it was good to bring the debate back to the general ideas

• Your reply speech would have benefited from more structure

Second Opposition

• Your points (constructive) were interesting and very impactful, but you were missing some key dots to have been fully connected

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christine Lang

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: m325

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Justine

Team Name: Louiseville

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Amanda Sultan Alexa Richstone

Arjan O'Brien Margaret Goulding

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Score
75
100

Score
74
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
149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good use of current + relevant examples
- your style is good, but very sing songy
- good organization

Second Proposition

- good organization in your speech
- watch your time management
- excellent clash to your opponents

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- great speaker style with a good balance of eye contact, gestures and volume
- lacking in depth, specific content
- rather than using analogies to support your points, back them up with supporting documents

Second Opposition

- lacking in specific, relevant content
- not engaging
- good volume and eye contact

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matthew Ehmeiser

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: 11325

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sinko Noble

First Speaker:

P Amund

Second Speaker:

Alexa

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>81</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Laiseville

First Speaker:

Ajan

Second Speaker:

Margaret

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>76</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

Proposition brings up solid the round. Opposition's refutation to compromise but also needs to impose

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Constructive arguments that stand throughout is decent but contradictory (Fed control leads will on provinces?)

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Max Schiller

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M 325

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Justine

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Amanda Sultan Alexa Richstone

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Louise Ville

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Arjan O'Brian

Margaret Goulding

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score
161
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
255
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Proposition
good Time Management
good use of examples to back up point
 - good idea of "Notwithstanding clause" escape argument to unite Canada as to provisions will be happy
 - Different provinces different needs
 - Program slower if Canada needs to intervene
 - Only true sense of law
 - kind of conceding to opp but we can have best of both worlds
Second Proposition
this was more rebutting but good
Refutation
 - good Refutation on unification
 - Second Refutation still stuck into as opp didn't respond to it well
 - Okay Refutation
 - Things get done quicker
 - Better representation
 - Working internationally?
 - Okay point but
 - good response

Judge's Comments: First Opposition
good Roadmapping
Bad time management - too much Refutation
Rebuttal
 - good explanation
 - Okay response to PUI
 - Stop to
 - The Fed will compromise?
 - Sort of agrees with prop.
 - Unification
 - Need to explain more why the Fed gov. should be the unification factor
 - Focus more on the environment Standpoint
 - Needs more good mapping
Second Opposition
 - Right off the bat, good talking about climate change
 - No intention to change through the provisions because they value economy better
 - Shall have been more in the first speech
 - good Machine on how to stop climate change
 - "Need to stop" (PUI)
 - Need more content

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Desmond Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M329

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Felicien

Team Name: Lacolle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

Zahra Slutchuk

Anna Kopylov

Score
80
100

Score
72
100

Score
74
100

Score
74
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
148
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good model
- strong constructive points
- effective summary speech

- point was weak → "change is good" and "fresh start"
↳ not developed
- reading notes a lot for constructive point

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

- refutation was dismissive and not focussed
- good point re: if money collected by the province, will be put to better use in helping those affected by legislation (compared to if funds collected by money)

- ~~strong refutation~~ attempt at reframing and re-focussing of the debate, but not much actual refutation of the many points offered by proposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Miranda Collett

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Félicion

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie Lei

Paul Zhang

Score
80 80
100

Score
72
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Laquila~~ Lacolle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zahra Slutchuk

Anna Koplovich

Score
70
100

Score
71
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

141

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Great job!

- be careful w framing -
a carbon tax is not symbolic
this frame could have weakened
your case if opp had pushed back
on it.

Second Proposition

- Good job giving pols
- be careful w sounding dismissive
or rude
- avoid doing explicit pre-buttle
try adding a new constructive
instead

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good job

- remember to make clear what
the sq is, whats wrong w it,
what your side wants to see
change explicitly
be careful w being too abstract
& broad

Second Opposition

- Good job

- try to come up w new responses
~~to~~ / to clash w the specific
points that came forward on the
other side.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nick Morrow

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M32a

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Felicien

First Speaker:

Andre Lei

Second Speaker:

Paul Zhang

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lacolle

First Speaker:

Zahra Stutchuk

Second Speaker:

Anna Koplevich

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

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

Team Score 157
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score 151
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- govt incentive breakdown for citizens
- ↳ Albertans care about individual rights vs no carbon tax
- whip speech = excellent
- Symbolic point not well impacted, carbon tax = not symbolic → broad was right characterization

Second Proposition

- be more polite! it is un-persuasive to mock other side
- avoid pre-emptive rebuttal of non-relevant issues to this debate

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- very rhetorically nice
- change is good point had little explanation of actual change that occurs → explain it
- careful with new info
- refutation was flippant

Second Opposition

- Great examples of jurisdiction
- refutation/rebuttal only 1:45 of speech! Do more of it especially with timing of content
- reframe in LO not MO

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sebastian Lopez

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Baire Comeau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Thomas Beschell

Simran Dhami

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Victoriaville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rohan N

Will S.

Score
76
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

154
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Themes are the same as point in the ball down
- Speech was very content based and didn't warrant the points well.

Second Proposition

- No refutation on the opposition's case

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Need to diversity arguments, made the same argument w/ three different examples

Second Opposition

- Good speech
- Make sure to restrengthen your own points

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matthew Anzoro Jk

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Bare Comeau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Thomas Beschell

Simran Dhani

OPPOSITION

Team Name: VictoriaVille

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rohan N.

Will S.

Score
74
100

Score
72
100

Score
79
100

Score
80
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

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- clear delivery but unclear break-up of case and structure.
- Argumentation:
 - excessive reliance on quotes. Need more analysis
 - first arg might not have been very relevant
 - are opp can bypass this constitutional problems well
- careful with time split
 - fewer POIs (took 3).
 - take

Second Proposition

- clear style
- not enough engagement with hard arguments from OPP.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- good args + evidence
- missing explanation of why fed can better implement policies?
- very your style more to underline important parts of speech.

Second Opposition

- great speech.
- good job pointing out gaps in PROP case (ie. incentive)
- interesting arg on balancing power.
- 2 comments, though:
 - a) Explain why federal gov't DOES HAVE incentive to care about environment.
 - b) Explain why provinces can't do an even.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Edward Lai

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Baie Comeau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Thomas Beschell

Simran Dhani

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Victoriaville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rohan N.

Will S.

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>72</u>
100

Score
<u>78</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>157</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- Overall, good speech.
- Okay handling of POI's.
- Try not to focus too much on the status quo to advance your case.
- Try to avoid contradictions: you mentioned that environment is an exclusively provincial matter, but then mentioned a constitutional amendment would be required to give provinces complete control.

Second Proposition

- Logic was hard to follow; you never explained how the declining economy is linked to the topic of debate.
- Specific terms (i.e. individual vs collective pollution) needed definitions.

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- Excellent constructive arguments.
- Constructive arguments could have used less repetition, though.
- Effective refutation
- 3-minute final speech could have done a better job summarizing the round.

Second Opposition

- Very good refutation
- Great handling of POI's.
- Could have spent more time reconstructing partner's arguments.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Akil Alleyne

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 2 Room: M34-1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ville Marie

Team Name: Shawnigan

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Fatima Anees Huda Abdelkarim

Annabelle Kollmar Philippine Delaby

Score
82
100

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
164
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: Very good intro & road map.
First Proposition

Judge's Comments: Good intro / theme!
First Opposition

- Very good job framing the background of this issue in Canada's constitutional federal system!
- Try speaking a bit more slowly.
- The argument about provincial autonomy would have benefited from some discussion of the advantages of more local gov't. in dealing w/ more local problems - e.g. provincial gov't closer to the people, etc.

- Choosing to offer your own plan was a gutsy move - & a risky one. It's not necessary for the Opp., & in this case, you risked ~~advocating a position that arguably violates Canada's Constitution, & (b) contradicting your~~ selves: If the federal gov't. will have full authority under your plan, the how can they be free to set their own policies? That sounds more like a system of mixed/divided jurisdiction - w/c is basically what we have now.

- Good summary, esp. on constitutional reform - BUT should've said to EARLIER.
Second Proposition

Second Opposition
- EXCELLENT intro, esp. ~~at~~ identifying common ground between both teams!

- Great intro, road map, & theme!
- Good responses to POIs
- Good ~~use~~ use of real-world examples of provincial legislation to illustrate your points

- Good "whack-a-mole" metaphor - though "race to the bottom" would probably have been more a propos. :-)

* BOTH PROP. SPEAKERS *: I was hoping to hear a more forceful rebuttal of the Opp's plan/model & the internal tension within it.

* BOTH OPP. SPEAKERS *: Good job arguing that national/international problems need national solutions.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: C. Balcan

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: M244

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Chateau Guay

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaari Urkanek

Emma-Jane Burns

Score
82
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Jerome

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Talia Trottenberg

Mia Su

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~~

Side Prop

- Very confident introduction with great pace.
- Keep this pace throughout.

How long will excess amounts of funds be spent fighting the fed? → this is only a short term expense

• Well explained consequences, but leave yourself time to complete your

Second Proposition analysis.

• In your refutations try to be more concise on why their lack of response shows agreement in what you are saying → your point still means.

• Missed opportunity to POI lack of action by some provinces - alternatives that replicate a tax

• The MP and MPP MLA both respond to the people and we can go to both of the offices.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Side Op

Good argument of unity of country and lack of division of effect on the government. ✓ (interprovincial)

↳ Fed = the jobs connect.

Second Opposition

Be sure to leave time to conclude.

Handled lack of action for economic growth well.

• Be sure to engage in giving POIs to progress your own argument

• Response to POI on pipeline was not handled with regard of ownership.

• Your fed example in health does not support your argument because the prov. is still in control with positive rather than punitive actions.

• 2nd speech missed opportunity to establish why each consequence exists on the prop side of motion.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christina Orlando

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: W242

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Vivek Sapru

Jessica Y

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Brunceville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rahul Singh

Lochlan van Egnard

Score
84
100

Score
85
100

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

Team Score

161
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

169
200

Wow!

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- You say it's not currently working Tell me why
- good child care example
- good response to POI
- what's bad about it being federally mandated?
- at times your points strayed too far from the environment
- good ball down speech

Second Proposition

- good intro
- why is it bad that the provinces are suing?
- not enough refutation
- a lot of mechanizing was missing
- ~~do we need the~~ careful with assertions

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Very good explanation!
- maybe read less
- good pts. of about indigenous peoples & their protection by the federal govt.

Second Opposition

- very good refutation
- good speaking style
- you should engage more with their strongest material
- very good speaking style

The flow with the 1st is good
 it's good to see
 the flow with the 1st is good

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Manuel Wiltzer

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: M242

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec

Team Name: Beauveville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Vincent Laporte

Jessica Yu

Pahul Singh

Lachlan van Egmond

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

Score
84
100

Score
86
100

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

Team Score

162
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

170
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- amazing use of evidence for analogy building
- great poi response
- your points were all unique and thought through
- make sure to also frame the debate

Second Proposition

- very clear.
- explain more about how the other sides points don't make sense even if they met the conditions you were critical of.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great clarity and outline of speech when you bring up things like the constitution, think about why we should turn care.
- your final speech was very good, but don't let the themes slip away.

Second Opposition

- This was absolutely brilliant you almost got me to believe that there really were no issues with the status quo
- Great refutation of the other side
- all your points were well linked to your points of the debate.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Dylan Theriault-Harris

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: ME47

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec

Team Name: Beauceville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Vivek Sapru Jessica Yee

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Pankaj Singh Jackie von Gmünd

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>86</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>170</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good analysis.
> effective use of examples
+ subsequent analysis.

Second Proposition

Needed more organization
+ clearer thread.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

High level of analysis
- very good understanding
of analysis.

Second Opposition

High quality down the
bench.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MUIR

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2 Room: M246

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Les Coteaux

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Maryam Syed. Gregoria Ginakas

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Adèle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dylan Lee

Daniel Bergerin

Score
<u>85</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>162</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

1 min into
Less introduction!
More specific/detailed model
NOT a speech!
stay focused on reason & evidence
Try to focus on reasons why
your ~~proposal~~ proposal solves a problem
effective mess of Provincial law
Reply More holistic approach required
Build down to 2 Q then compare each case

Second Proposition

1 min into too long
Argument by exaggeration is
not very effective. POT should be
short & focused
More detailed refutation of
what op actually said is required
especially from 2nd speaker.
You don't need to prove that
an environmental crisis is bad.
Please don't overact.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

good structure (Timing?)
Good detail & v.g. analysis
Engagement through POT ✓
Reply Very well structured
& very effective.

Second Opposition

Timing!
Interesting argument.
It was NOT clear what your
refutation was targeting.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: H. GUTHRIE

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: 306

PROPOSITION

Team Name: CHICOUTIMI

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ALEX LOGAN

JESSE LIU

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SAINT-SULPICE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

MATTHEW HOMA

SASHA KLEIN

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>167</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>162</u>
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Great research strong delivery -
- Arguments well substantiated.
Quite a good summation in the rebuttal speech.
Some good clash in the POIs -

Second Proposition

Vigorous delivery.
Some good clash. Clash might sometimes deal with the whole topic better.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Animated, keen delivery. *Sum up rebuttal speech better.*
Vigorous, pointed clash.
Great involvement to POIs -
Great POIs - Relax - some POIs might be even clearer -
More relaxed delivery would make complex issues clearer.

Second Opposition

Vigorous involvement on issues
Begin with win more focus and composure:
Define the checks and balances you mention more clearly -
Smoother, more relaxed delivery would in places be clearer.
Conclude more effectively -

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nicholas Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: A209

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Pierreville~~ Pierreville

First Speaker:

Cydney Carnuthers
~~Phyllis Phyllis~~

Second Speaker:

Holly Jamieson
~~Holly Holly~~

Score
74 74
100

Score
75 75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker:

Sean Oh

Second Speaker:

Simran Vig

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score

149 149
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Had good organization from the get-go
- Unique constructive arguments brought forward
- Relevant example of Province of PEI
- Since it is a prepared topic, try providing more evidence
- Certain points of speech became too repetitive (especially conclusion)
- more analysis needed (why is PEI not being helped under s/a?)

Second Proposition

- Used compelling rhetoric:
 - "1 size fits all"
 - "can't drive out industries"
- Nice constructive point
- Good comparative argumentation
- Be careful about ASSUMPTIONS:
 - why are provinces more efficient?
 - why are provinces reliable?
- Would have liked to see more

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- ~~nice outline of burdens & stance~~ → good organization
- nice outline of burdens & stance
- Overall, refutation was good
 - ↳ In regards to claim that provinces can still have say on your side, then why is PEI being ignored?
- Relevant, impactful constructive w/ good analysis
- Key point: climate change affects EVERYONE
- cut-down use of lingo such as "Recognize..."

Second Opposition

- Needs to slow down point out flaws in other side's refutation
- Thorough Refutation & good reconstruction
- Why won't provinces be ignored on your side?
- Interesting argument on priorities
- Good organization ✓✓
- POIS ✓✓
- Be careful about assumptions when characterizing feeds.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Robinson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 200 ²

Room: 209

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Pierreville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cydney Carruthers

Holly Tompson

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gatmeau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sean Oh

Simran Vira

Score
84
100

Score
83
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

167
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Well organized
- Good delivery - even better to look up more p
- > Perhaps model could have dealt with some possible opp issues
- > good arguments but even more effective to go into greater depth e.g. Why, then why does that matter they why is that true?
- > good summary conclusion - perhaps a bit longer than it needed to be - might have been better to expand on your case with some of the same
- > need to respond to issues of why gov will act and why the fed shouldn't also have any

Second Proposition

- > Good delivery
- > your point was well supported
- > need to deal with why it is more important than env. issues
- > why will provinces look at
- > Try to do more refutation of their key points
- > Respond more to the attacks
- > Good expansion of your partner's points - even better to deal with their attacks

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- > good clear thesis/caseline
- > great refutation
- > good use of Montreal agreement over ozone.
- > good delivery
- > Very effective rebuttal!

Second Opposition

- Very effective introduction
- Good to refute but don't ignore your partner's refutation
- Well organized
- > Excellent analysis of Race to the Bottom point
- > Good delivery - at times could look up more
- > Try to have time for a longer ~~substantive~~ conclusion

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julia Abundo

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: A 209

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Pierreville
~~Chaparral~~

First Speaker:

Cydney Carruthers
~~Erica Planchon~~

Second Speaker:

Holly Jamieson
~~Alana Seedorf~~

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker:

Sean Oh

Second Speaker:

Simran Vig

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Score
84
100

Score
83
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

168
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- In the future, consider spending a bit more time on your model beyond definitions
- Great structure!
- Make sure to really impact your points, tell me why they matter!
- Great callback to POI.

Second Proposition

- Great Structure!
- Make sure to refute as much as possible; clash leads to good debate.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Your style is excellent: clear, concise, thorough and pleasant to listen to

Second Opposition

- Excellent style & hook!
- Be aware of verbal ticks (right?)

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CHLÖE SHAHINIAN

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M 336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Val D'Or

First Speaker:

Lauren Chang
AN KIMPTON

Second Speaker:

Anne Kimpton

Score
73
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rigaud

First Speaker:

Michael Chen

Second Speaker:

Jasna Zhuo

Score
79
100

Score
77
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

156

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Need more discussion of the types of local issues which only provincial governments have sufficient knowledge of
- Make sure that your summary speech critically reviews the round in your favor

Second Proposition

- Make sure that in your refutation you respond to the strongest material from the opposing team
- Mechanize your point on respecting mandate provincial voters give to their government

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- We need more mechanization of how Canada's reputation suffers on global stage purely due to environmental issues
- Would have been good to see more sign-posting in the summary speech

Second Opposition

- emphasize why a lack of a 'consistent' policy facilitates a 'race to the bottom'

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Daniel Mandelken

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Val d'Or.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lauren Chang.

Anne Kimpton.

Score
72
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rigand.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Chen

Jasna Zhou.

Score
80 79
100

Score
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

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Don't need to thank everyone so much.
↳ time is valuable, fill it with arguments.
- summary rebuttal should not just summarize ideas said. weigh them against each other.
- ~~Good~~

Second Proposition

- Don't need to thank everyone.
- Keep asking why.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Very good boil down.
- How will things happen? - Mechanisms.

Second Opposition

- More refutation.
- World Stat. → # of changes, in gov. point was about changes in policies.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Val D'Or

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lauren Chang
Alex Kippen

Anne Kington

Score
72
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rigand

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Chen

Jasna

Score
79
100

Score
78
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

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good job ~~at~~ road mapping early on
- Points need more analysis. Good to tell us what will happen but need to tell us how & show examples of it happening

Second Proposition

- Analysis needs to go further (see notes for partner)
- Good premises for arguments ~~at~~

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great boil down
- 1st constructive was somewhat assertive, needed mechanization
- Race to bottom pt. landed.

Second Opposition

- Fairly good explanation of mechanism ~~at~~ of constructive pt.
- Good ref. pt. re: credibility
- Other clash pts lack some analysis, evidence.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mita Bhattacharyya

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Li

Helen Pan

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Bruno

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Su

Daniel' Liu

Score
82 83
100

Score
90 90
100

Score
80 80
100

Score
84 84
100

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

Team Score
163 163
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
167 169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- 1. Great structure
- 2. Fabulous fluency
- 3. Clear definition
- Excellent understanding of key pathway principles
- great mechanization
- some arguments needed to be clarified - extra tax wouldn't automatically be given to the consumer
- excellent structure
- great rebuttal in principle but it was weaker on mechanization
- excellent evidence but there was repetition → try to develop mutually exclusive pts.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- 1. Excellent energy + connection
- 2. Some arguments were mutually exclusive.
- 2. Good linkup of all evidence back to main point.
- 3. Slow down; great arguments were often hard to follow.
- 4. Some arguments weren't mutually exclusive.
- Rebuttal could have been stronger re: economics
- write it down fast enough - apologies!
- excellent, calm, ordered argument
- clear communication style
- excellent rebuttal

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Yasmeen Dajani
PROPOSITION

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: M334

Team Name: Bedford

Team Name: Saint Bruno
OPPOSITION

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Emily Li Helen Pan

Andrew Shi Daniel Hu

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score
163
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
165
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good set up / explanation of status quo of federal/provincial jurisdiction over the environment
- Very solid analysis
- A little bit too fast

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Too fast (make sure you're speaking at a pace that allows judges to take notes)
- Great job covering lots of aspects & dimensions - merging some of them might make the structure easier to follow.
- Thorough & creative analysis.

Second Proposition

- Great analysis & refuting generally, but make sure you hit all of opp's points.
- Good POI about the constitution being written in a different context.

Second Opposition

- Great job focusing the debate on the specific benefits of federal control.
- Careful not to rely on tradition / existing laws without explaining why they are valid.
- Some of Gov's analysis on the impact of economics on individuals / families.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Sury

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: M334

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

Team Name: Saint Bruno

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Li

Helen Pun

Andrew Shi

Daniel Lu

Score
82 82
100

Score
80 80
100

Score
81
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score
162
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- impact points made
- explain why points matter
- good analysis and mechs.

Second Proposition

- make sure you refute everything
- good argumentation
- ↳ tell me why it's important

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- fine mechs fine for clash
- good analysis
- don't rattle off mechs, try to combine them as they were repetitive

Second Opposition

- really good speech
- try to do more weighing

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Zac Beaman

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: M312

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rawdon

First Speaker:

Allastair

Second Speaker:

Rally

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Beloeil

First Speaker:

Christina

Second Speaker:

Hana

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>160</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>154</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Great Mechanization
 LD explained exactly
 how his points would
 be true

Prioritize time better
 L too long

Second Proposition

Great Refutation
 L spoke about the
 how Alberta is mitigated
 L necessary for you
 to win

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great style, great organization
 Good points! well mechanized
 - good representation of provincial
 interests vs Fed interests

Great LOR -> true weighing
 of the important points

Second Opposition

- Engage more with
 prop's arguments
 L more analysis!
 - Good speaking style

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ANDREW KAPLAN

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 2 Room: M328

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Montreal

Team Name: Amos

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Thane Morgan William Ahern

Livia Ion Julia Wang

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>155</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>161</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Strong speaker, make sure to define the terms.

Second Proposition

Excellent clash, very extensive. could have used more evidence.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Strong speaker, well established case. more evidence needed
organization

Second Opposition

Strong clash, confident speaker.
Make sure to clash with all points.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Bernice Lucas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: 326

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: PORTNEUF

Team Name: Cowonsville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

NORA McLENNAN Jake
WALDNER

Maya Mior Natalie Viegas

Score
76
100

Score
74
100

Score
80
100

Score
82
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
162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Very good effort!
Try to give some POI's
Good points were given.

Second Proposition

Very good effort!
need more eye contact through & change voice level.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Well Done!
Good effort on the POI's.

Second Opposition

Well Done!
Good pacing, eye contact, well organized speech, arguments both times.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Andrew Vandembussche

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Portneuf

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nora McLennan

Jake Waldner

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Cowansville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Maya Mior

Natalie Viegas

Score
79
100

Score
80
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

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Clear roadmap
- Needed to mechanize why provinces will take action
 - ↳ consider Opp's points/stance at best
- Why is federalism bad?
 - ↳ Need more evidence

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great burdens
- Great style
- Strong constructive
- Could deal w/ comparative more

Second Proposition

- Needed more engagement
- Needed rebuilding
- More roadmapping & signposting

Second Opposition

- Lots of content in short period → Excellent!
- Really clear engagement

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Louden

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M326

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: portneuf

Team Name: coevansville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aora McKeenan

Jake Walcher

Maya Mior

Natalie Viegas

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>74</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>150</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

excellent debate.

side prop needs to work on

great speeches

Second Proposition

road mapping.

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. HASTINGS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: 205

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SOREL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Elawad Muhammad Mahmood

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: PORT CARTER

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Briley Hillyard Xander Biddulph

Score
77
100

Score
75
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
152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- very nice introduction
- motion is well defined
- a little too much reading
- good use of examples (failure of feds in past)

Second Proposition

- excellent signposting
- extremely articulate speaker, well organized
- great point re: geography accompanied by examples

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- great signposting
- strong ball down, really great closure provided at end

Second Opposition

- good signposting
- develop points more fully

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Elspeth Easton

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: 205

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sorel

Team Name: Port Cartier

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Elawod

Muhammed
Mahmoud

Briley Hillyard

Xander Bickdolph

Score
75
100

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

Score
74
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

150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- strong introduction/understanding of the topic.
- Specific examples would have made your points stronger.
- Looking @ impacts can make things even more effective.
- Careful about new examples

- Really good examples/expansion of points.
- Adding some more ~~are~~ impacts would
- Your questions were strong

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

- would have been nice to rebuild your parthuts points
- you are a very strong speaker and your arguments were well thought out.
- Make sure you clarify who/why you are ~~are~~ using the examples you are

- you highlighting it needing to be more than moral
- good points that were laid out.

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex ^{Kantroubis} ~~Smith~~

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: A205

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sorel

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima Elawad

Muhammad M

Score
75
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Port Cartier

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Briley Hallyard

Xander Biddulph

Score
76
100

Score
74
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

150

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

"need more points"

what are the direct benefits to the ev

Good response to poi

Why does prov say ~~code~~ so

much more about the people

Second Proposition

Good clarity/refutation - needs to touch more of their case not just one point

poi already better response

Good characterization

many good ex

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Joint

nation level issue take national response

no world leader (but going to talk pking)

economy will just add to the ~~costs~~ ^{expenses} ~~and~~ ^{make}

Refutation needs to be more than your stance tell us why even if it's not what you still win the point

Second Opposition

Fair refutation for the 27 yr

politicizing and national

you can be first politician on the prov IV vs fed IV

"politicians being bad" doesn't help

you stop this trap

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BRIAN COLBY

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 2 Room: A206

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gov Reberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yusef Elmarghby

Ashley hieu

Score
77
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sheebrook

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Adam Marchant

hian hieu-Boyet

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

157
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jack Stewart

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: A1344

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Croix

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cameron O'Hare

Claudia Leroux

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Maskinongé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Evan Laurence

Charlie Simms

Score
77
100

Score
77 100
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
144
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
145
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- note: under constitution currently is fed responsible; this is what they want to change
- careful: just because federal gov not great doesn't mean no reason provinces also bad.

Second Proposition

Careful when giving examples about current action for provinces and provinces need for action / give more role to provinces, though your construction does address this

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Careful to provide reasons why the federal gov does not fall victim to the same processes outlined by your partners.

Second Opposition

- Nice migratory birds spec!
- your point on carbon leakage was restating your partners analysis
- go deeper on refutation