

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matthew Amieser

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: M329

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Belweil

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christine Lv

Ham Aref Taha

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Hyacinthe

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yuan Wang

Pandora Sivas

Score
81
100

Score
82
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

163
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Both teams had very good as effective in their refutation and overall I felt that Opp did a all of Prop's ideas whereas Prop

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Constructive material but were not engagement with the opposite side. better job of engaging with missed certain key issues of Opp's case.

Second Opposition

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nick Morrow

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 3 Room: M244

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Pierreville

First Speaker: Cydney Carrother      Second Speaker: Holly Jamieson

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Shawindigan  
~~Shawindigan~~

First Speaker: Annabelle Kellner      Second Speaker: Philippine Delaty

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>151</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<u>155</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

### Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- took too many P.O.I.s (5) and it stopped your train of thought (limit to max 2)
- gives examples of policy that needs time rather than just saying (we need better longer policy etc)... i.e. more consistent, more promises - WHAT IS CONSISTENT / WHAT PROMISES
- try and have two points, was very repetitive with just one point and the sum up of one point
- structure of reply: start themes right away!

### Second Proposition

- Second speaker shouldn't have more points than first - doesn't give much opp time to engage
- says things like there will be less consequences NEED EXAMPLES
- assertions made like people more racist NEED EXAMPLES
- ↳ no link is made
- every point relies on the point PM's got better - if you do this, you need evidence or analysis - it is not objectively true...

→ Good refutation ✓ - esp on change adaptability point

### Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- Great use of examples → how bad policy the trumps can be overturned versus continuing
- ↳ talk about harmful impacts of this now
- Good on inability to change mind ✓
- link is very unclear about less voters (because they lose interest?)
- ↳ Good reply speech structure
- ↳ ability to engage i.e. Trudeau ✓
- only 1 min on ref... could use more to respond

### Second Opposition

- ↳ speech was a stream of consciousness - esp when having new point / ref and rebuttal → clearly say what you are doing
- pipeline example was too long of speech
- Good refutation to PM can't get things done → if they are good they will stay in office - strong and dealt with most of other sides material
- Great engagement!

THas Canada, would have the Prime Minister  
serve a single ten year term w/o re-election

### Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael D. Giorgio

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: 1205

#### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Vivek Sapra Quilrea

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Vivek Sapra

Jessica Yu

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

#### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Val Ode

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Omre Kimpton

Lauran Cheng

Score
76
100

Score
73
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	149
	200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Wish you talked about a world  
where decisive Executive action is  
necessary although unpopular.  
Try not to get too pinned up on  
examples

Second Proposition

Don't P.O.I a point that your opponent  
forgets to refute  
Good reconstruction! Try and spend  
more time rebutting main  
points rather than tangential

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Stellar refutation  
Be sure to provide analysis  
for your impacts because  
it was difficult to buy  
them at times

Second Opposition

Good refutation!  
Try to rebuild your  
partner's points w/  
more constructive analysis

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Moren Al Jordi

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: A 205

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Québec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Vivek Sapru

Jessica Yu

Score
78
100

Score
75
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Val d'Or

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anne Kington

Lauren Cheng

Score
76
100

Score
73
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

149

200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Clear concise, deep analysis and good structure.
- Build down should be worked on. Clear structure is necessary, there should be more explicit.
- Clarification of the model was necessary in build down.

Second Proposition

- Clarification was necessary but also clash with side opposition was lacking. Need an answer for "what if the person voted was effectively terrible and there are no checks and balances"
- Good job on creative point but may be tone it down a bit. ☺

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Nice sign posting, and time splits.
- What was presented as a case in general was an implicit refutation rather than a clear reasoning for why opp/status quo is better.
- Good themes and good build down.

Second Opposition

- More sign posting is needed
- Second speaker needs a second point
- Good job on asking about what - fine wish for a 15 year term p.m.

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lauren Kim

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: A205

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Québec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Vivek Sapru

Jessica Yu

Score
81
100

Score
78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Val d'Or

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anne Kimpton

Lauren Cheng

Score
77
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

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- overall good speech and constructive
- good use of examples
- clear world building analysis
- only comes out in buildown
- didn't touch a lot of key material from MO's speech in buildown clash

Second Proposition

- overall good speech
- ensure you're refutation deals with specific lines of analysis from opp not just general idea
- need mechanism for why parties would want to overcome deadlock
- last link to tie together argument

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- good refutation, efficient considering how little time you spent
- lots of great ideas in refutation
- points / constructive also had lots of great ideas
- needed more mechanism and analysis
- good organization
- use more examples

Second Opposition

- overall good engagement
- take fewer POIs
- more clear signposting to keep speech organized (no clear constructive)
- need deeper refutation to take down gov. constructive

that opp didn't had deeper analysis of sound & engage with

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nabeel Ahmed

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M344

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Maskinongé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Evan

Charlie

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>72</u>
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex

Jesse

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
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

- ↳ Weird model
  - ↳ What can PM actually do
- ↳ Lots of assertions
  - ↳ Mechanize more

Second Proposition

- ↳ Try to distinguish your material from 1<sup>st</sup> speaker
- ↳ Develop arguments more

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- ↳ Don't try to dress a practical argument as principle... it's not helpful
- ↳ Focus on key issues in reply, as opposed to minor ones

Second Opposition

- ↳ Somewhat repetitive
- ↳ Need more mechanization

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Saffy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M344

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Maskinogae

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Evon Lawrence

Charlie

Score
73
100

Score
72
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Logan

Jesse Liu

Score
79
100

Score
77
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

- Try to fill your time
- Good analysis and impacts
- Explain why your points matter
- Try to keep your speech organized

Second Proposition

- In your rebuttal, go point by point and explain why your arguments refutation is bad. Also highlight what they don't refute, and explain why it's important

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Actually refute their case, not just their one-liners
- Good construction
- When doing principled arguments, explain why it matters
- very good breakdown

Second Opposition

- Good refutations, although it should have come out in 1st app.
- Your construction was ok, try to use more tech's and differentiate yourself from 1st app.
- Try not to be too repetitive

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Dante Ventulien

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: M344

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Masconope

Team Name: Chicoutimi

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Evans

Charlie

Alex Longin

Jesse Liu

Score
74
100

Score
72
100

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

- MPs being re-elected is a bit tricky, PM is an MP.
- What about no confidence vote?
- In-depth analysis needed

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- There is a difference between sounding smart and sounding arrogant, please stay humble in rounds  
↳ Avoid words like "destroy"
- Sometimes big words don't help, stay simple  
↳ "principles of democracy contingent..."

Second Opposition

"people's opinions change"

↓  
easier, more direct, and makes more sense.



## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Yasmine Abi-Hanna

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M326

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Portneuf Varennes

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Suhaso

Lucas

Score
75
100

Score
73
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Gatineau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sean Oh

Simran Vig

Score
79
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

157

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- needs to organize speech more clearly
- more thoughtful nuanced analysis

Second Proposition

- do refutation
- better characterization of the world (ex. say voter turnout is high there are too many elections but doesn't link those or explain why this is the most likely explanation)

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- when making a principled point, explain why the principle is important
- don't make assertions

Second Opposition

- good refutation
- explain "minority rights" point in more detail + don't give vague examples

**-Championnat National De Débats- Jr. Debate Nats.**

Nom du juge: Liz Stratton

No. des Juges: 3 Ronde: 3 Salle: M326

**AFFIRMATIF**

**NEGATIF**

Nom d'équipe: Portneuf Valenais

Nom d'équipe: Gatineau

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Sahasro D.

Lucas Tarry

Sean Oh

Simran Vig

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

Score
80
100

Score
77
100

En évaluant le pointage à accorder, gardez en tête: le contenu, le style, la stratégie et les points d'information

L'équipe Total

149
200

L'équipe gagnante est  
( Veuillez encercler ):

L'équipe Total

157
200

AFFIRMATIF / NEGATIF

Commentaires des juges:  
Premier débateur:

- clear delivery & strong points about the challenges posed by 4 year term (ex. learning curve for first couple years & focus on re-election during last 2 years)
- work on showing why the benefits your side claims cannot work in the opp. world
- good POI - try offering even more
- conceded a bit too much ground
- Second débateur: to opp. in reply
  - good responses to POIs & refutation of opp's points (ex. <sup>positive</sup> impact on voter behaviour)
- perhaps consider using your refutation on voter turnout information & engagement as a constructive argument
- try to offer more POIs

Commentaires des juges:  
Premier débateur:

- strong POI engagement
- clear opening & stance
- good use of specific examples to support arguments & solid understanding of main issues
- to strengthen your refutation try to distinguish responses from your constructive args.
- compelling summary & contrast of opp case strengths & Prop's weaker points.
- Second débateur:
  - strong refutation of some Prop. ideas, but could offer deeper analysis (ex. why is 4 years ~~the~~ the right length if voters change their minds earlier / why 4 yrs. and not 6?)
  - important argument well analyzed
  - Please allow opponent's to complete their POI - do not interrupt for at least 15-20 seconds.

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CECELIA LOPEZ

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: m326

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: PORTNEUF Varennes

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SAHASR BHOJNEK

LUCAS TERRY

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: GATINEAU

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SEAN OH

SIMRAN VIG

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Score
80
100

Score
79
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

159

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- DELVE INTO IMPACT OF POINTS → BROUGHT UP GOOD IDEAS BUT LET US KNOW WHY WE CARE
  - GOOD JOB ON POI'S (ANSWERING)
  - I LIKED THE WAY YOU ENDED THE SPEECH, BROUGHT IT ALL <sup>CALL</sup> <sub>ALL</sub>
- Second Proposition

- ANTICIPATE POIS AND HAVE RESPONSES PREPARED FOR IF IT IS NOT CLEAR / YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND
- NEED TO EXPLAIN WHERE YOU ARE GOING IN SPEECH AND CLEARLY REFUTE

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- GOOD SPEAKING STYLE
- STRONG OPENING, VERY CLEAR AND CONCISE
- DON'T WAIT FOR A NEW POI TO TAKE POI
- THOROUGH REFUTATION

Second Opposition

- GOOD SPEAKING STYLE
- BIT OF A HARSH POI RESPONSE
- BE MORE CLEAR ABOUT WHERE SPEECH IS GOING → REFUTATION / NEW POINT, WERE JUMBLED

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Riley Cohen

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: A306

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sorel

Team Name: Saint Bruno

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Muhammad Mahmood Fatima Elawad

Andrew Shi Daniel Lu

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
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

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Tough side. Don't spend so much time on your intro + model
- good pace.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Good speech. Slow down a bit though
- Good Boil down. But make sure you leave enough time for your second question.

Second Proposition

- Good timing + pace.
- Try to focus more on rebuilding

Second Opposition

- Good speech. But focus more on refutation.

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Max Schiller

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: 2306

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sorel

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Muhammad Mahmood      Fatima Elawad

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Bruno

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Andrew Chi      Daniel Lu

Score
83
100

Score
82
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
165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Time management, too long on Model 1:45

Second Proposition

- Don't need to repeat the Motion
- Distinguish between your points

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Slow down
- Time Management

Second Opposition

- Interesting point, I like it
- Maybe in the first speech

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Robinson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 03 Room: 306

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sorel

Team Name: St. Bruno

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Muhammad Mahmoud

Fatima Elwad

Andrew Shi

Daniel Lu

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
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

163

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- good intro
- need to expand model more - extra details would help
- > some assertions could use more support
- well organized
- good conclusion
- great eye contact
- good delivery

Second Proposition

- > good ~~intro~~ good signposting and introduction
- > good use of voice
- > even better to look up more - try to be less tired to notes
- > even better to deal more with the opp case
- > good conclusion
- did that well when responding to
- why aren't these arguments correct ->

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- good intro
- very good arguments - well supported
- > try to do more direct refutation - needed more time
- > vary pace more, ~~slow down~~ slowing down would make you more convincing
- > good conclusion
- > good POI
- > Good rebuttal

Second Opposition

- > great POI
- > good argument - explain even more why it matters
- > good refutation and rebuilding
- > even better to organize even more
- > good summary at the end -> even better to build down to the key issues
- > good delivery
- p.g nature of parliament gov
- number points and attacks

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jonah Rosen

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M354

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Magog

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anais Lewis-First

Julia Reimon-Sorod

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Beaverille

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lachlan von Egnard

Pahl Singh

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
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

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Elspeth Easton

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 334

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Magog

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anais Lewis ~~First~~ Julia Reimer

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Beaucvill

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lachlan Von Egmond Paul Sing

Score
78
100

Score
79
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

- o missing the model/def was slightly problematic
- o you had a very interesting point it would have been even stronger if it was expanded.

Second Proposition

- o long term cost was an interesting argument - showing the impacts/directly contending with the question would make things even stronger

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- o your points were very interesting, but be careful about being overly aggressive with points.
- o very strong rebuttal
- o try and expand examples and

Second Opposition

- o rebuttal/clash was very strong.
- Really good analysis.
- o unique point
- o edge balls.



# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Gabriel Di Bert

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 334

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Magog

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anais Lewis

Julia Reimer

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Beauville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lachlan Egmond

Pahul Singh

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>80</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>159</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: Allie McGowan

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: A207

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rigaud

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael

Jasna

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Partneuf

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nora

Jake

Score
76
100

Score
76
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

152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

1. Do a characterization of how average voter votes now and how that changes with the motion

2. Discuss the Canadian election system (re elect party, not PM) and that means 1. re even more correct

Second Proposition

1. Have example or describe a situation where your arguments specifically true (re, trade negotiations)

2. Impact IR compared to opp arguments and weigh outcomes

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

1. Impact the changes to democracy and impact of backlash from citizens

2. More engagement with gov

Second Opposition

1. Weigh possibility of harmful politicians in power for larger against gov's proposed benefits

2. Impact the accountability you get on opp

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keenan MacNeal

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: M325

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Mont Laurier

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ashton

Danica

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Croix

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Cameron

Claudia

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>78</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>158</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: Julia Abundo

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 3 Room: M333

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saint Jerome

Team Name: Lacolle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tania Trottenberg     Mia Su

Anna Koplavich     Zahra Slutchuk

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

Score
79
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
159
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- Make sure to make your mechanisms clear in your first speech
- Excellent use of questions in whip speech

**Second Proposition**

- Be careful with generalizations
- Excellent rebuilding

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- Make sure to use examples and fully explain your point
- Good structure

**Second Opposition**

- Be cautious with your rhetoric; make sure your mechanisms are well explained
- Loved your style! Very passionate!

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. Smith

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

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Beetherville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Petra Plander

Hana Sereeda

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Cowansville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Maya Mior

Nathalie Vegas

Score
78
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

154

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Would appreciate examples to back up young points, more mechanization to explain how the things you say will happen could happen.
- Strong presence / pres. style
- Poi responses need a bit more explanation

Second Proposition

- Not clear why 4 years term is not long enough for voter engagement
- Did not fill time (spend final minute re-constructing)
- Good refutation re: change of gov.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Democracy Constructive was impactful, but could use a bit more development
- Not clear to me why new ideas can't emerge over the course of 10 years.
- Strong Poi responses
- Good points in build down, but they come late in the debate.

Second Opposition

- More example, further mechanization of points needed
- Constructive not all that different from partner's
- Relevant points raised in clash.

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MUR

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: M328

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sherbrooke

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Adriano Morehouse Liam Leduc-Bate

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Naperville

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Maz Mitchell Aidan Eisan

Score
76
100

Score
73
100

Score
77
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

150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Good ideas  
Very theoretical  
You need to illustrate your ideas with some specific examples.  
Issue of Gov. Gen. dismissing PM should be included in Def. or Model.  
2nd point sounded very much like first.

Second Proposition

→ POI should be a Q <sup>NOT a statement</sup>  
Your 1 constructive ~~seemed~~ interesting but your explanation and illustration of it made me confused  
Your refutation needs to be more substantial and you need to be more accurate as you reference what was said

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

You MUST give specific refutation <sup>very good</sup>  
No need to repeat Resolution  
highlighted ~~can~~ potential contradiction of model. Reply Focus on 2 big points of clash. (questions)  
Your structure could still follow usual ~~st~~ pattern despite you thinking it didn't need to  
Keep Refutation & Constructive separate  
2nd point Very Interesting & shows good understanding.

Second Opposition

why did you keep referring to Britain  
I found it very difficult to follow your reasoning,  
What were your arguments?  
Pardon me? what was this all about?  
You started your constructive after the start of protected time!

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Edward Lai

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: M343

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Montréal

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Thane Morgan

William Ahern

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>73</u>
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Joliette

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kuan Zhang

Nazar V.

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>71</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>149</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Your case rested on the argument that 4 years is insufficient time for a P.M. to get things done. This was a decent argument, and you did a reasonable job handling Opposition's refutations.
- "Level playing field" argument required clearer explanation
- More succinct and coherent boil-down speech would have helped.

Second Proposition

- More evidence needed to back up points (i.e. how 10-year terms lead to less false information being spread).
- More explanation of arguments needed (i.e. how systems we have in place would prevent abuses)

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Great POI's
- Very good refutation during first speech.
- You did a good job of attacking the core of Prop's arguments.
- Solid understanding of Canadian political system.
- More succinct boil-down would have helped.

Second Opposition

- Decent POI's that threw off proposition.
- Both refutation and constructive arguments required more structure and coherence.

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Akil Alleyne

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: m242

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte-Justine

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amanda Sultan      Alexa Richstone

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danae Pepeliassis      Ava Olin

Score
83
100

Score
83
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

- Good intro & road-map but remember to summarize your partner's constructive arguments as well.

- The main argument Prop should make on this topic is that this kind of term limit would enable Prime Ministers to govern the ~~the~~ country without constantly worrying about getting re-elected, thus without being influenced by crass self-interest. I was hoping to hear that point made.

- The "better legislation" point was weak - ~~the~~ good laws are passed in 4 years all the time.

Judge's Comments: Second Proposition

- Good intro, ~~the~~ road map, & signposting

- Good job taking POI

- Be careful not to go over time!

- The point about ~~making~~ people "get on board" with the govt. is shaky. Just because a govt. is in power for a long time doesn't mean people will be more likely to support it.

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- Very good intro, road map, & signposting (i.e. outlining transitions from point to point).

- Excellent posse, confidence, articulation, & pacing!

- Good points about the democratic process & accountability to the electorate.

- Solid summary & rebuttal

Judge's Comments: Second Opposition

- Great intro & road map

- Good POI on the possibility that voters will change their minds.

- Good rebuttal about the need to enable voters to remove a govt. from power if they become dissatisfied with the govt. in less than 4 years.



# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Francesca Fagnoli

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M242

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Justine

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amanda Sultan

Alexa Richstone

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lachute

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daral Pepelassis

Ava Oliv

Score
82
100

Score
81
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

163

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*General for everyone*

*Consider starting with points instead of refutation, especially if you're using your points to refute.*

*Careful to save time for your second point and to make sure the analysis for it is different not just a different title.*

Second Proposition

*Make sure the points you bring up make sense in the real world if this bill were to pass*

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*Summary speech might be easier in the future to break things up into broader themes.*

Second Opposition

*Some analysis from this speech should have come out earlier*

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kathryn Bjornson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M 242

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sciinte - Justine

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Amanda Sultan Alexa Richstone

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Lachate

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Danae Pepelassis Ava Olin

Score
84
100

Score
83
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
167
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments: First Proposition**  
 Definitions confusing  
 "no elections between 10 year terms"  
 - remember to also give us your partner's points - you never told us specifically why 4 years is not enough time to pass bills.  
 Good organization, nice style.

**Judge's Comments: First Opposition**  
 - Good refutation + organization. Nice analysis.  
 Your summary speech ~~didn't~~ wasn't organized by themes. But by points. Good Analysis.

**Second Proposition**  
 - differentiate your ~~part~~ points from your partner's point,  
 - you talked about your bill providing more change + less change - confusing.  
 you confidently answered PoI's. Good rebuilding of points.

**Second Opposition**  
 Again, Good refutation here. Good PoI's. Nice analysis. You argued well for the need for voters to have an avenue to remove ineffective leaders.

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CHLOE SHAHNIAN

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 3

Room: A220

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Les Coteaux

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Gregoria Ginakes

Marya Syed

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Drummondville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Li

Jonathan Chu

Score
80
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

157

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Make sure that the mechanization of your arguments is not reliant on examples
- might have been beneficial to see a more robust model

Second Proposition

- Make sure that you refute the strongest material from the opposing team

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Be careful not to broadly generalize about the behaviours of minority groups
- Try to analyze the comparative when refuting

Second Opposition

- Make sure that your reconstruction is not just repetition of your constructive

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Massimo Di Lullo

No. of Judges: 2 Round: 3 Room: A200

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Lake

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Gregoria Ginkos      Marya Syed

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Orunminville

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Eric Li      Jonathon Chu

Score
<del>79</del>
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
156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

### Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- Analogies Don't Help your case
- Develop Contentions Further
  - ↳ Mechanize
- Definitional issues

### Second Proposition

- Need More Analysis
- Refute All of the opps Points
  - ↳ Do not repeat 2 line to refute multiple arguments

### Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- Contentions were similar
- Time management Issues
  - ↳ 2nd point only lasted 30 seconds
- Learn How Federal Gov't Works
  - ↳ \* Votes of No confidence
- WATCH OUT FOR CONTRADICTIONS

### Second Opposition

- Need New Content
  - ↳ Contention & refutation

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Abigail Trevino

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

### PROPOSITION

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

First Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Second Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Ahea Gupta

Aliya Kafani

Patrick Shield

Anna Beaudry

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>81</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>163</u>
	200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*Excellent modelling and road mapping*

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*Great analysis, good examples*

Second Proposition

*Really great roadmapping, needed more examples + analysis*

Second Opposition

*always take other side's arguments at their best!*

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nicholas Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: A209

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~XXXX~~ Huntingdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rhea Gupta

Aliya Kabani

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Acton Vale

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Patrick Shield

Anna Beaudry

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
156
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Clearly outlined definitions, model, burdens & stance
- good organization
- key points brought forward
- Be sure to fully develop & analyze points ( impacts, WHY )
- Offer more POIs

Second Proposition → <sup>more</sup> POIs

- Good refutation regarding how Senates can still be filled w/ one party under S/Q
- Interesting point regarding accountability
- Be sure to spend more time on constructive material (you had about 1-min left). Provide impacts

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- great opening
- Interesting constructive material
- point about Senate didn't have that much weight in round
- refutation was thorough & compelling
- "more time to lie, be corrupt"
- characterization of promises was super important to round

↕ nice POIs

Second Opposition

- compelling introduction
- interesting & important point about "a generation losing out"
- could have come out earlier or been expanded on
- Make sure to take on opposing side @ their best (refrain from straw-man)

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Daniel Mendelson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: A209.

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Huntingdon.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rhea Gupta

Aliya kabani

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Actonvale

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Patrick shield.  
~~Anna Beaudry~~

Anna Beaudry.

Score
83
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
164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- why is what you are saying true.  
↳ Need more analysis.
- You are asking good questions but not answering them well.  
↳ rebuild don't repeat.
- Good public speaking.

Second Proposition

- keep asking why.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Very good POIs
- Very good speaking style.
- Good analysis → thorough and understandable explanation of consequences on diff. branches of gov.
- For summary rebuttal frame in terms of comparing world.

Second Opposition

- Very good speaking style.

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: H. GUTHRIE

No. of Judges: \_\_\_\_\_

Round: 3

Room: 1237

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: HUDSON

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

PENELOPE CHOLAKIS

MONTSERRATI ALVAREZ

Score
80
100

Score
77
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ST. REMI

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ALEX LAURIN

JAKE SURRY

Score
81
100

Score
79
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

160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Strong delivery - good organization -  
Conclude more substantially -  
Develop further analysis of what would happen in this 10 years.  
Be sure the PO1 has a clear bearing on the issue & an opp. point -

Second Proposition

Some good new argumentation.  
Develop support for it further.  
Deeper analysis and explanation further.  
Conclude more substantially -

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Explain more of why such a long 10 yr. term would be harmful.

Strong, vigorous delivery -  
Develop your analysis and explanation further -

Second Opposition

Don't take a PO1 until you're really ready -

Should you take so many POs?

Improve organization - review the 2 or 3 pillars of your case -

Vigorous speaking. Be willing to engage POs. Don't overdo it -  
(avoid) to your points



TH, dJ Canada, would ~~not~~ have prime ministers serve a single 10-yr term (w/o possibly for re-election)  
 Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Miranda Collett No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: M237

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Hudson

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Penelope Cholakis

Montserrat Alvarez

Score
79 <del>78</del> <del>78</del>
100

Score
75
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: St. Rémi

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alex Laurin

Surrey  
Jake Smith

Score
81
100

Score
79
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 job! good constructive ☺
- try to engage more charitably with the specific arguments that came out ~~in~~ (particularly in LO)

Second Proposition

- good job! ☺
- remember to build on the content & clash and add more new substance to the round.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- good clash - I really liked it ☺
- remember to explain why specifically things like "interactive gov" are so crucial / required for good democracy in principle regardless of whether or not all legislation gets passed as efficiently as possible.

Second Opposition

- really good clash! ☺
- adding another constructive argument to the round would have added to your case well. (perhaps developing the risk of sliding into dictatorship).

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Amar Desmond Dante ✓

No. of Judges: 3 Round: Sat-1 Room: A305

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Granby

Team Name: St. Sulpice

First Speaker: illy rich Second Speaker: Kendall Barnes

First Speaker: Matthew Homa Second Speaker: Sasha Klein

Score
74
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
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
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Gov case suffered due to a lack of identifying a problem or situation that the policy would improve.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Opp position that re-election is validation + calibration of party success carried.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Desmond Viegas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: A 305

### PROPOSITION

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Grandby

Team Name: St. Sulpice

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lily Rich      Kendall Barnes

Matthew Noma

Sasha Klein

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Score
<del>79</del> 79
100

Score
<del>78</del> 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

157

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- only point was that <sup>term</sup> 10y would allow "deeper understanding of citizens & provinces"
- ↳ but not developed or backed up

- rebuttation began late (@ 4:30) but was effective → use dismantability in side prop
- good constructive points
- spoke a bit too fast
- excellent summary speech

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

*constant ability to re-deb new topics each time results in more disruption*

- constructive points lacked clarity
- ↳ "harms and benefits"
- good speaking speed

- good rebuttation → if cannot make change after 4y, if inexperienced, how would 10y be better
- good rebuild of partner's point → voting more after results in increase buy-in
- uses the word "right" too frequently

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. HASTINGS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M342

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: CHATEAUGUAY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

KARAN URBANEX EMMA BURNS

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ETHAN EDWARD

Score
82
100

Score
84
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

166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- nice introduction
- defined model well
- great tone
- more concrete examples needed

Second Proposition

- great persuasive tone
- good point about "image" for re-election

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- articulate, organized speaker, great tone
- very effective ball down - themes well identified

Second Opposition

- good destructive constructive point
- excellent refutation
- great specific examples

\* No. P.O.I.s needed on both sides

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christine Lang

No. of Judges: 3      Round: 3      Room: m342

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Chateauguay

Team Name: Rimouski

First Speaker:                      Second Speaker:

First Speaker:                      Second Speaker:

Kaari UrbaneK      Emma-Jane Burns

Ethan Chiang      Edward Yang

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

Score
84
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
164
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- excellent speaker style
- excellent speech organization & understanding of the issue

Second Proposition

- very good speaker style
- good explanation of SNC as corruption example
- did not offer or accept any POIs

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- excellent vocabulary
- great concrete example of Israel

Second Opposition

- exceptional speaker
- current + relevant examples used to build case
- incredible point by point clash
- did not offer or accept any POIs

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: PATRICIA DONNELLY

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 342

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Chateauguay

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaari Urbanek

Emma-Jane Burton

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rmousky

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elhan Chang

Edward Yang

Score
82
100

Score
84
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

166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*Final speech structure + lovely speaking style;*

Second Proposition

*Good use of election cycle mechanics;*

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*Good use of specific examples - Bismarck + Churchill*

Second Opposition

*Very strong speaker - excellent point by point rebuttal*

*Everyone needed to include more points. Both sides said: "we offer better policy making & delivery" - neither side fully proved this!*

# Championnat National De Débats

Nom du juge: CHRISTIANS

No. des Juges: 3

Ronde: 3

Salle: M339

## AFFIRMATIF

## NEGATIF

Nom d'équipe: St. Felicien

Nom d'équipe: Ville Marie

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Premier débateur:

Second débateur:

Angie Lei

Paul Zheng

Fahima Anees

Huda A

Score
85
100

Score
79
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

En évaluant le pointage à accorder, gardez en tête: le contenu, le style, la stratégie et les points d'information

L'équipe Total

164
200

L'équipe gagnante est  
( Veuillez encercler ):

L'équipe Total

163
200

AFFIRMATIF / NEGATIF

Commentaires des juges:  
Premier débateur:

Came to the debate  
excellent summation,  
well organized and  
well delivered.

Second débateur:

do not start with an  
ad hominem attack,  
especially when  
unwarranted.

Commentaires des juges:  
Premier débateur:

Strong arguments &  
refutation; summation  
was not sufficiently  
summarizing -  
need to organize  
more.

Second débateur:

good refutation but  
missed some opportunities  
to refute some clearly  
weak arguments.

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Zac Beaumont

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 3 Room: A37a

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: St. Rims

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angie

Paul

Score
86
100

Score
78
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ville Marie

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fatima

Huda

Score
82
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Great points  
Great materialization  
Good impact  
Great PMR → keep up the good work

Second Proposition

GOOD POINTS  
Needs to structure ideas  
Better  
→ good refutation  
engage with best and worst case

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Good analysis  
Well spoken  
LOR: focus on themes  
Good ref → but needs more 'summary'

Second Opposition

Good style  
Needs better structure →  
Some good lines of refutation → be deeper!



# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Arbalaan Ehaemi

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M339

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sf. Felicien

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Angre Lei

Paul Zhang

Score
<u>86</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Mlle Marie.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Fahma

Yoda.

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>79</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>160.</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: JULIA LEA

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: M340

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Thetford Mines

First Speaker:  
Rafay Ahmed

Second Speaker:  
Dishita Emayavaramban

Score
74
100

Score
76
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Bedford

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Helen Pan

Emily Li

Score
77
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

157

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- could have impacted arguments more
- good point about the limit taken to enact good policies
- organized

→ Lacked analysis  
→ Boil down ~~analysis~~ <sup>only re-stated their stance</sup> instead of focusing on points of clash.

Second Proposition

- Didn't rebuild clearly
- Lacked organization / structure and thorough analysis all around.
- some very strong pieces of analysis, such as mentioning and explaining the checks and balances that keep legislative good bodies re-election (strongest piece of analysis)

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Strong refutation
- convincing analysis (and relevant)
- Muddled in the sense that you said you'd give me 3 points, you gave me 3 different point titles but they were all the same point about poor representation over 10 years.

Second Opposition

- Very strong analysis.
- current job at proving why checks and balances are not enough to maintain proper representation
- Should have dealt briefly with the burden of an election process since the speech became repetitive/redundant towards the end

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keith Moussa

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 1246

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rouyn Noranda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony Wu

Hugo Hu

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Roberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yusef Elmuraghy

Ashley Liu

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>74</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
<del>149</del> <u>150</u>
200

### PROPOSITION

### OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Strong roadmap
- Practical and principle both provided and clearly labeled
- Slow up
- Need more mechanisms and more than just examples

Boil Down: - No roadmap → becomes difficult to follow  
 - No themes  
 - Does not fulfill requirements of a boil down speech

Second Proposition

- Good roadmap
- Not enough time for analysis on constructive
- Slow up
- Need more impact on constructive  
(clear)
- Refutation needed more "in best scenario"

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Clear roadmap
- Engaging speaking style
- Refutation effectively tackles weaknesses of prop's case
- Refutation needs to not only display weakness but also provide examples of the worst case scenario

Boil Down: - 1st theme good, 2nd comes across as just refutation - Not enough time left for themes  
 - Overall weak

Second Opposition

- Good roadmap
- Strong response - very effective
- Very solid constructive
- Organization needs a little work (rebuilding + refutation muddled)
- Drive constructive home!

No PO given

No PO given

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isaac Cape

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M246

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rouyn Noranda

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony Wu

Score
<del>75</del> 75
100

Hugo Hu

Score
75
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Feberval

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Yusef Elmaraghy

Score
76
100

Ashley Liu

Score
75
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

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Better case organization
- Strong points
- Characterize long term change to prove it's any good
- Better organization for build down

Second Proposition

- Really hammer on why opp responses aren't good enough
- Good constructive

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Don't be afraid to ~~also~~ explain why the so works, not every thing is flawed
- Refutation needed to be better (more than just "that is an assertion")

↕  
POIs

Second Opposition

- solid constructive
- Explain why short term change can be positive

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Manuel Wiltzer

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M246

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Rainyn - Noranda

Team Name: Paloveral

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tony Lee

Hugo Hu

Yusef Elmarghy

Ashley Liu

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

Score
<del>75</del> 76
100

Score
<del>75</del> 75
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

<del>151</del> 151
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

make sure your poi's are thought through before asking it.  
Good that you pointed out the lack of content / evidence in opp refutation.

However, if you do that, you need to make sure you offered evidence.

Good modeling, but make sure you only make to what you know: impeachment

Don't be so repetitive on one topic if you need to fill time.

Second Proposition

- Don't rebuild so much on a point that was repeated so much

- Try to give more poi's

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Good division of points.
- Good modeling.
- Make sure that when you make a point, you tell me why I should believe you.
- good poi response

Second Opposition

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jarren Fifer

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: M213

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Baie Comeau

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Thomas Beschell  
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

Simon Dhanu  
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

Score
76
100

Score
74
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Port Cartier

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

150
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: DAN ELBLING

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: A206

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: 3 Rivières

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elliot Costa

Ty Deutcher

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Farnham

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ethan Chan

Jack Barry

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

156

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- You organized your constructive speech really well.
- Your reply speech would be easier to follow with clearly separated themes or points of clash

Second Proposition

Your constructive point was really interesting. I think it could have been expanded on.  
Provide some examples of long term projects, maybe multi-phase projects

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Your speaking style is easy to follow and very persuasive.
- When you portray the PM, try to avoid one-sided characterisations (like purely good or purely evil). This provides a more nuanced analysis

Second Opposition

- Your refutation was very thorough
- Be careful in saying things like "this clearly shows" without really hammering home the step-by-step thought process

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jack Stewart

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M346

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Puneet Chhina

Anisha Biswas

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Adèle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dylan Lee

Daniel Benjamin

Score
77
100

Score
75
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

<del>150</del> 152
200

PROPOSITION // OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*clear structured and more time*

Second Opposition



## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michelle Murphy

No. of Judges: \_\_\_\_\_

Round: 3

Room: M346

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Puneet Chhina

Anisha Biswas

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Durhamville~~ Sainte Adele

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dylan Lee

Daniel Bergerin

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>76</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>153</u>
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Slow down please  
please breathe and put  
period at the end of sentences  
you need to think about  
more careful structure  
at times you shifted ideas  
very quickly  
Some thoughtful ideas

Second Proposition

also slow down  
try not to repeat your partners  
points so much  
you speak with authority  
and confidence

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Work on more clarity  
in your organizational  
structure  
unclear statement of the  
issues  
great confidence and passion  
slow down a bit

Second Opposition

refreshing pace after all  
the speed-talkers before  
you  
generally good organization  
and argument structure  
good listening in POI response  
but you could take more  
POIs

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Alex Moutroubis

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 346

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Gaspé

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Pan et China

Anisya Bissas

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sainte Adèle

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dylan Lee

Daniel Berseuin

Score
78
100

Score
75
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

153

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

2 point <sup>are the same</sup> ~~point~~ <sup>or then be one point</sup>

long term you only happen on your side

you

- re election focus

nuclear model

you need to clash more with

preparation long vs bid

↑

Yis this more impact

Second Proposition

long term

why's 59, bad

~~case~~

Case text

You can't say no long term change

happens but too much change is happening  
long term

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

needs more clarity on long term

- no assembly

- no premises

- terms are good

- election give evidence

"action into your hands" - what do they lack if the?

bring up some of the point early to expand & much more

Second Opposition

good get out of model

little more structure would help a lot good point

but make better road map for time

need more mech and impact of your point

they told you that they make long term ~~change~~

# Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Louden

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: 17

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: St. Victoriaville

Team Name: Louisville

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rohan Nair

Will Shekerek

Aryan O'Brien

Margaret Goulet

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>76</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>152</u>
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

excellent debate on both sides

model on side prop was perhaps too long and involved and cut into speakers time

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

side prop were excellent speakers but opp was able to hold onto the debate based on their analysis prop side while good was flawed and did not stand.

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Brian Casey

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M336

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rowdon.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alastair Thomson

Rally him

Score
<b>77</b>
100

Score
<b>83</b>
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia ION

JULIA WANG

Score
<b>81</b>
100

Score
<b>80</b>
100

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

Team Score
<b>160</b>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<b>161</b>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*The proposition did not respond directly to several  
opponent arguments.*

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Opposition

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sebastian Lopez

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M336

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rawdon

First Speaker:

Alastair Thorburn-Vittols

Second Speaker:

Rally Lin

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

First Speaker:

Livia Ion

Second Speaker:

Julia Wang

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
77
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

- needed stronger modeling
- round had to be framed more

Second Proposition

- definitely needed to attack the stronger points out of opp

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- assertions that existed weren't well warranted

- needed to attack the strongest points out of Prop

Second Opposition

- don't rely too heavily on examples

## Junior National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Gabriel Trottenberg

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 336

### PROPOSITION

Team Name: Rawdon

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alastair Thornburn-Vitels      Rally Lin

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Amos

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Livia Ion      Julia Wang

Score
80
100

Score
82
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

162
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Clear model
- Move arguments needed from second speaker

Second Proposition

- Extensive refutation
- Spend less time on polarization argument, more time on rebuilding

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Rely slightly less on examples, provide clear mechanisms instead.

Second Opposition

- Good refutation