

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: VINAY DESAI

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: F-1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia RF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rory Flynn

Mattea Roach

Score
<u>87</u>
100

Score
<u>84</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~NEW~~ QUEBEC CS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Foster Salpeter

Riky Cohen

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<del>79</del> <u>80</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>171</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<del>163</del> <u>164</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- ~~Good~~ very good speech
- organized and presented well
- good catch on the Tommy Douglas thing

PMR

- good summarizing
- explained how all the things he did correspond to the definition of a hero

**Second Proposition**

- Points were well-discussed
- ~~Rebutted~~ Rebuilt / Rebuttal very well done  
(ie: he couldn't implement his ideas because he died!! well done)

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- Speech was well-delivered and structured
- Spoke well and had clear ideas  
→ make sure to relate your facts/points back to the bill and how it doesn't make him a hero
- Summary was well-done.

**Second Opposition**

- Politicians arg. was very creative, but could have been explored more
- very well structured (points, rebuttal, rebuilt)

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aman No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: F1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS RF

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

Rory F

Matt R

Score
<u>88</u>
100

Score
<u>84</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC CS

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

Foster S

Riley C

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
<u>172</u>
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<u>164</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon Hoyt-Hallett

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: French 1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia - RF

Team Name: Quebec CS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rory Flynn

Matt ea Roach

Foster Salpeter

Riley Cohen

Score
88
100

Score
84
100

Score
84
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

172
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

164
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Fantastic delivery. very engaging
- Very strong cohesion in your case logic
- Strong analysis in POI's & in Reply speech → Tommy Douglas great!
- Great job!

Second Proposition

Strong clash - Say vs Act - assassinatn  
↳ fantastic!

Great use of POI's

Link evidence to logic!

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Very strong clash
- analysis of flaws in opponents case.
- Clearly identify case logic for opposition early in the round.

Second Opposition

- Very interesting main pillar → credit for creativity.
- Slow down

Great job

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Catherine Holloway

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: History

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario SS

Team Name: Manitoba HR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zaid Salameen  
~~Emil Stanca~~

Emil Stanca  
~~Zaid Salameen~~

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sophie Hershfield

Yael Ripstein

Score
84
100

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

167
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

159
200

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Clear explanation of what makes DM stand out - role of making Canada what it is today  
Strong delivery

S/R themes very successful  
Try to reserve hand gestures for meaningful moments in your speech.

Second Proposition

Unclear how DM protected rights:  
try to give more specific historical examples

Strong refutation, successfully combatted OPP points  
(but try to avoid informal phrases like "totally falls")

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Some good refutation about DM's relevance today

Point about being traitor to England was less successful given context of WHY he opposed them

I had trouble following the organization of your speech

Second Opposition

Refutation was somewhat repetitive - when you are making similar refutation to your partner, try at least to use different phrasing

Shady character point well received  
More historical detail would strengthen point about turning back of Irish Canadians - what specifically did he neglect to do?

Well done all around

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tristano Tenaglia

No. of Judges: 5 Round: 2 Room: History

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario SS

Team Name: Manitoba - HR

First Speaker: Zaid Salameh  
~~Emil Stanca~~  
 Second Speaker: Emil Stanca  
~~Zaid Salameh~~

First Speaker: Sophie Hershfield  
 Second Speaker: Yael Bipstein

Score
86
100

Score
84
100

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
170
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Proposition**

Very calm and collected manner of speaking was very easy to understand. Well prepared and POIs were answered in a respectful and clear manner. When making POIs, if you are continually rejected, save your points for the summary. Good that you addressed all points in the summary.

**Second Proposition**

Started and finished strongly, which is very important. Addressed your POIs very directly and professionally which really had an effect on the opposition. Make sure to phrase all your points and POIs properly.

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Opposition**

Articulate and very clear on points made throughout debate. When addressing POIs, talk about the point made directly, don't go around it. When summarizing, do not continue to use old points in order to counter. Make old points fresh and try to use more historical facts.

**Second Opposition**

Points were brought in and said nicely, but all topics should be thoroughly discussed in order for everyone to clearly understand all points. Summary should also reinforce all previous points in order to remind and reflect on what was discussed.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Zachary Baker

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: History Room

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Zaid Salahoun  
~~Emil Stanca~~

Second Speaker:

Emil Stanca  
~~Zaid Salahoun~~

Score
85
100

Score
82
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba - HR

First Speaker:

Sophie Hershfield

Second Speaker:

Yael Ripshtein

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
167
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- great start, good definition and outline.
- good points
- great analysis for what makes him a hero
- related opp points very well.

Second Proposition

- good point.
- good rebuttal.
- try to organize your ideas better
- good analysis on what hero he fought for minutes.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- good points
- don't repeat same things as much
- good rebuttal of your points
- was very convincing

try to go further into analysis and effect of those points.

Second Opposition

- very good analysis, but points got repetitive with your partners,
- watch your organization
- spoke very well

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: EDWARD BECHARD

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: HISTORY

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:  
Zaid Salameh

~~Emil Stanca~~

Second Speaker:  
Emil Stanca

~~Zaid Salameh~~

Score
<del>84</del> 84
100

Score
83
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba HR

First Speaker:

Sophie Hershfield

Second Speaker:

Yael Ripstein

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<del>167</del> 167
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

161
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Proposition**

Compelling introduction  
watch out for un-grounded assertions  
eg. "articulated need for confederation better than anyone else"

**Second Proposition**

Good speech. Effective argument + rebuttal.  
watch out with un-grounded assertions  
"no one else was defending minority religious rights" "no one else cared for minorities."

Comments given orally.

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Opposition**

Compelling characterization of Mebel  
watch out - speech sometimes felt repetitive. It seemed you introduced or foreshadowed your eventual arguments several times.  
watch out - a crowd of ordinary Canadians might not, intuitively, believe that betraying her status?  
Effective final response though!

**Second Opposition**

Good and compelling characterization!  
- watch out for grand assertions - some seemed unsupported by historical evidence  
eg he was "selfish" "role on coat tails" "turned his back on all supporters & greater good"  
- watch out - repeated partner points.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Clarissa Brisseau

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: History

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zaid Salcheen  
~~Emil Stanca~~

Emil Stanca  
~~Zaid Salcheen~~

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba HR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sophie Hershfield

Yael Ripstein

Score
80
100

Score
<del>79</del> 79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

168
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

160
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Very good job setting up the prop case
- Strong conviction.
- Good analysis of how his actions make him heroic, how reformation is admirable.
- Nice summary, liked cmy reference

Second Proposition

- Just watch your organization.
- People did care about the maritimes, just not as much as others
- Effective rebuttle
- An example of how he stood up for catholic rights?

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Need more examples of how he didn't fit in with Canada,
- Good relating McBee to other heroes
- Take less POIs
- Why is it not good to make a British traitor a Canadian hero?

Second Opposition

- Points too close to partners.
- Examples would have strengthened the case.
- Drive home the fact that McBee had no tangible ~~base~~ results and others contributed more.



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aslin Flynn

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2 Room: Spers 1

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS - DW

Team Name: Quebec K-Z

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elizabeth Duff

Marcus Willmott

Athina Khalid

Maria Zimmermann

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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 material
- Good dealing with and POs
- Very presentation

**Second Proposition**

- Strong speaker
- Maybe more constructive
- Good PO/

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- Good ideas, not substance based
- Not a comfortable delivery

**Second Opposition**

- Lack of content / ~~not~~ not compelling
- Calm tone, nice answers

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Cameron

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Speirs 1

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Nova Scotia - DW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elizabeth

Marcus

Score
80
100

Score
85
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec - KZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Athina

Marid

Score
70
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

165
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

145
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- + clearly structured arguments with ample supporting evidence.
- monotone, monotempo and slightly rushed presentation.
- + addressed and deconstructed opposing arguments clearly and thoroughly.

Second Proposition

- + clear, confident presentation with good use of tempo and intonation to emphasize important points.
- + clean, firm wrap up (time well-managed).
- delivery of POI's slightly long-winded.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- too many "ums" and "likes".
- insufficient evidence to support arguments.
- + good eye-contact and interaction with audience and opposition.

Second Opposition

- +/- creative character-bashing arguments against McGee but also lacked clear, concise examples to back up the arguments.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Veenu

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Sp1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS-DW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aizhen Duff

Maria Willmonte

<b>Score</b>
81
100

<b>Score</b>
84
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC-KZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ahina Khalid

Maria Zimmerman

<b>Score</b>
78
100

<b>Score</b>
77
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

**Team Score**

165
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

**Team Score**

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition**

Clear  
↓  
more variety in construction

**Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition**

↳ more evidence → go in depth  
↳ very clear !!

**Second Proposition**

Excellent responsiveness  
↳ Rebuttal order a bit better go in  
order of their points is a useful  
way to do this

**Second Opposition**

↳ Good support of evidence  
↳ More evidence & variety would be good  
↳ RESPONSIVENESS

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: AMIR KHOURAM

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: ENCLICH 2

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC - SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SAMANTHA STACEY

HOLDEN BEGGS

Score
77
100

Score
81
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: AB - GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SWISH GOSWAMI

ASHISH KC

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

158

200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

160

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- Good ~~definition~~ definitions, and excellent points
- try to read your speech less, and engage with the audience via eye contact.
  - outline (roadmap) your speech, so that we can easily follow the points.

**Second Proposition**

- Very good rebuttal good points, and not excellent response to P.O.'s
- Fantastic speech, good pose.

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- Good organization of your speech <sup>with clarity</sup>.
- Good clash with criteria presented by the Gov't.
- try to lay out each speech point as it comes (signposting your speech)
- Very good final speech.

**Second Opposition**

- Points sometimes contradicted in order
- good rebuttal
  - work on structure throughout debate.

*the*

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Megan Gagliano

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: Eng 2

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-SB

Team Name: AB-GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Samantha Starkey

Holden Beggs<sup>a</sup>

Swish Goswami Ashish KC<sup>1</sup>

Score
80
100

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

- ~~roadmapping~~ ✓  
→ I would attempt to clarify the titles
- while the speech was delivered passionately, the looking down to notes took away from the strength of the arguments.
- must make mention of his successfully meeting criteria
- ought to have crystallized.

EVERYONE: Move Away from reading your speeches

Second Proposition

- roadmapping ✓
- was the first to prove that McBee was indeed looking to benefit Canada.
- amazing point by point refutation.
- you're a very strong speaker, try to make away from reading your speech.

I could see that in your clash, which was done on the spot.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- great roadmapping
- the point that McBee was a follower was very strong and would have been much more compelling had
- THEMES were great and crystallized the entire round. dealt with McBee being a Canadian HERO! successfully.

Second Opposition

- first of your side to state that, despite all the good he did, he didn't do it for Canada, he did it for the Irish!
- ~~roadmapping~~ ~~roadmapping~~ discussion as a Canadian Hero.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Deirdre Casey

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: English 2

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC SB

Team Name: Alberta GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Samantha Starky Holden Beggs

Swish Goswami Ashish KC

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

159
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Make criteria as clear as possible  
Beautiful speaker.  
Make sure to engage in  
reply w/ key stances like  
"regional hero" or controversial  
status.

Second Proposition

Careful assuming opp is  
based on tenuous evidence  
when your case is too.  
→ Good rebuttal,  
convincing speaker.  
To all — Fact wars are not helpful to your case!  
Try to refute ~~thoroughly~~ <sup>more deeply</sup> and to engage  
with each other as much as possible.  
try "even if" rebuttal to avoid this!

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

→ more point by point would  
help you first speech  
Great Reply! Would have  
liked to see idea of controversial  
status earlier, it is an  
interesting stance and would  
lead to greater team cohesion.  
(same goes for regional hero  
stuff)

Second Opposition

More rebuttal very important  
in the second speech,  
don't leave so much for  
partner

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: PETER SEELAGYI

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: ENGLISH-2

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC-SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SAMANTHA STARKEY

HOLDEN BEGG

Score
79
100

Score
83
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: AB-GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SWISH GOSWAMI

AJITH K C

Score
<del>80</del> 81
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

162
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Need for better analysis  
in rebuttal.  
would have needed to  
refute points about Regional Hero  
and controversy

Second Proposition

• Excellent analysis

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Controversial element  
should be further argued

Second Opposition

Regional Hero concept should have  
been main argument

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JONATHAN CRAIG No. of Judges: 5 Round: 1 Room: ENGLISH 2

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: BCSB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SAMANTHA STURKEY

HOLDEN BELLS

Score
83
100

Score
84
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ALBERTA - GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SWISH GOSWAMI

ASHISH KC

Score
84
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
167
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
166
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Proposition**

very smooth, poised speaking voice + elegant speech.  
Two definitions (dict. + Can. Her.) a bit muddled - the second set the terms you used well, though these could have been used more consistently.  
Great handling of questions throughout.  
Clear emphasis on Confederate role + Maritime connection.

**Second Proposition**

Excellent grasp + ~~believable~~ <sup>convincing</sup> characterization of facts + their relative importance to merits of both sides' argument. Strong + well-developed argument about ~~the~~ aftermath of assassination.

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Opposition**

Great speaker - animated, articulate, and convincing. Careful about not rushing to end of speech. Questions very convincingly handled. Useful characterization of betrayal with relation to Irish community, but this wasn't linked to main ~~argument~~ context - Canadian. Two potentially really useful arguments - that TDM was regional figure +

**Second Opposition**

good but not great - just needed a bit more emphasis from both speakers.

ASHISH - very strong speaking presence, but felt your speech was one where a relation of details to larger picture could have been more developed + clearer.



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Celina

No. of Judges: 3

Round: #2

Room: Math 3

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie Denham

Score
<u>86</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Safir Jazayeri

Amolak Singh

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

**STRONG ROUND!**

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

☺

Team Score

165

200

good!

Team Score

<u>166</u>
200

5:49

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

house = Canada  
heco = high symbolic importance

good  
great speaking style!  
good pace

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

Nice opening

stop reading  
look at your judges

#### ① Campaign for education for minorities

- ↳ Religious minorities.
- ↳ Catholic vs. Protestants
- ↳ introduced a piece
- ↳ BN Act contributed to the

#### ② Stopped US from invading

- ↳ army that hated
- ↳ risking life & political career!
- ↳ very good.
- ↳ against brotherhood. good!

acts saved lives which are acts of a hero

P.O.I  
↳ just a threat  
prevented U.S. war & helped Canada

#### Refutation

we are a secular society that values multicultural society therefore not relevant... what do you mean for his time? → he is dead now we cannot condemn for the sins of his life

#### ① Refutation of his philosophical policy

- ↳ deprivation of liberty etc

#### ② Repetition

↳ Catholic theocracy  
↳ OK expanded relations with UK  
↳ loyalty to Queen...  
↳ OK

#### ① Second Proposition

#### ① Contributions toward unifying Canada

- ↳ new National Party linked to resolution. Good!
- ↳ economic prosperity more successful... i.e. redundant wouldn't you say?
- ↳ encouraged a domestic economy!
- ↳ led to a period of economic prosperity

duty of politicians

Stop reading!

Good mapping  
a little nervous... it's ok talk a deep breath we have all been there

#### ① Second Opposition

quotation from N. A. ... good.  
① failed to be inclusive  
↳ downplayed order  
↳ moral goals or political goals  
↳ does it really matter?

#### ② Catholic argument

↳ fight for Irish Catholics...  
only Christians were...  
↳ good pt! → Lewis very good.  
↳ Riel

Refutation  
↳ acceptance  
↳ convinced French to join

wait with rather first  
Refutation  
↳ downplay  
↳ But he was a man of his time!

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ryan Rogers

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Math-3

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Québec-DS

Team Name: British Columbia -DJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie Debban

Safir Jazayeri

Amolek Singh Dhillon

Score
87
100

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

167
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

163
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

5:49 / 3:19

- Great eye contact and speaking style
- In first point, effectively outlined McGees legislative contributions
- Second point effectively outlined contributions in terms of speaking out against the Fenians and justified this as heroic
- Got cut off by a POI, promised to address later instead of addressing at time of asking
- Was surprised you did not talk more about assassination
- Effectively cleared up issue of beliefs and actions
- Did much of what should have been your partner's rebuttal

Second Proposition

6:15

- Consider using questions/themes in build down

- Good style but too much reading; note enough eye contact - make sure you make eye contact with judges
- Continued partner's pointing out of McGees' accomplishment in many different areas and effectively linked these to how they improved the nation
- Your reconstruction should do more than just re-stating your partner's points, you also need to talk about opp's responses to those points
- Rebuttal was very short, manage time better to do more of this

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

5:39 / 3:15

- At some points it felt like you were reading off the page
- Great rebuttal, but if you say that his system of funded schools was not a positive contribution you have to qualify this
- I have some issues with you holding 'heroes' by purely modern standards
- But did his belief in anti-democratic political philosophies translate into anti-democratic action in Canada?
- Monarchy fine better
- Demonstrated high breadth of knowledge
- Does a Canadian hero have to be born in Canada?

Second Opposition

5:50

- Overall very effective build down speech (true, they did not relate political philosophies)

- Once again stressed the need for a hero to be completely pro-democracy - this link needs to be better explained
- Be careful - Monarchy does not necessarily mean a lack of democracy
- Effectively pointed out many of McGees' shortcomings
- Again, troublesome to hold heroic figures by modern standards (yes, women could not vote, but the Constitution was still very revolutionary for the time)
- Structure speech so as to not introduce constructive material in protected time - considered unfair

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marianne Amar

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M3

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec DS

Team Name: BC DJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie Denham

Safir Jazayeri

Amdak S. D

Score
86
100

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
168
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

really good last speech!

Second Proposition

need more eye contact & reading  
good links  
be carefull on reconstruction & refutation

big words but ~~we~~ need to explain them more  
Need more eye contact

↑ read ~~too~~ much!

Second Opposition

~~need~~  
need to explain more  
good pointing out  
be carefull of analysis of concepts

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ABHINAV GUPTA

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

Round: 2 Room: E3

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: SK - SM

Team Name: Manitoba - G0

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ahmereen Saleem

Layle Mowmin

Oreste Curume

Mariam Guindi

Score
70
100

Score
75
100

Score
69
100

Score
70
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

145
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

139
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Criteria given, but no factual support
- Excellent job with POI's as you have a talent for turning OPP's arguments on themselves
- Too general
- No definitions

Second Proposition

- Excellent job with rebuttal as you caught holes in OPP's arguments

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Misunderstanding of concepts such as multiculturalism, liberty, equality, and especially giving opinion as fact on whether people can truly change/be forgiven
- Missed easy POI refutation when Dirty Harry is provincial hero
- ⇒ Answer: not Canadian (as that is what we're resolving)

Second Opposition

- Strong delivery
- some logical misunderstand as partner (above)

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JJ Gerstein

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: E-3

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK; Sm

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ahmereen Salim

Layla Moumin

Score
73
100

Score
76
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~Manitoba~~ Manitoba - 60

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Oreofe Okunnu

Mariam Guindi

Score
72
100

Score
70
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

149
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

142
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- powerful speaker
- try to look more at your judges
- good info.

Second Proposition

- quick thinking on the floor
- take point one step ~~forward~~ <sup>further</sup>
- good eye contact

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- = good pace when speaking
- try to avoid agreeing with res. when saying that McGee did honourable things and should be recognized
- strong speaking style

Second Opposition

- confident speaking style
- too aggressive at times
- thorough rebuttal

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ariel Melamedoff

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: E-3

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sk: SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ahmercen Salim

Layla Uloomia

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: MB: 60

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Derek Okonu

Mariam Guindi

Score
72
100

Score
71
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

149
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

143
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Proposition**

- strong style
- Good info, but needs more analysis into Why these are the criteria
- some sort of comparison (ie. who isn't a hero) would have helped

**Second Proposition**

- Dealt well with POIs
- Good clash
- slight contradictions with partners' points
- Not a lot of substance in your speech (constructive)

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Opposition**

- Thorough rebuttal, though straw-manned props case
- watch your response to POI's - you conceded that he ~~was~~ should be recognized

- Slippery slope - Mcgee's hero status wouldn't affect others, and if it would, you have to prove it.

**Second Opposition**

- too much focus on multiculturalists
- very strong speaking style, but don't get angry
- needed more analysis into why heroes have to affect diverse groups of people

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Amanda Siino

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: Eng 101

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: MAKD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Peter Koczanski      Peirce Dickson

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: AIPK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kanjiasam      Noah Pirono

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
162
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

you only have 3 minutes to boil down so you don't need to use as many examples, try to take more time for a boil down that's cohesive. These examples would have been used before.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Be careful when you speak quickly because you occasionally mumble and it is difficult to understand.

Second Proposition

Try to go directly after the POIS. Where I was, you danced around a bit so be careful.

Second Opposition

Be careful of your reliance on your papers and reading. But you were still able to make it work.

Overall, strong round, good clash, all are well spoken.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jeremy Obrand

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: English 1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Petr Koczanek      Pierce Dickson

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kariyawasam      Noah Pinno

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
163
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

### Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- Strong opening, definition and evidence
- Fight for nationalism and multiculturalism
- response to POI was a little weak
- very good response to second POI
- watch the protected time

### Second Proposition

- awkward phrasing of POI's
- stop pacing
- answer the POI
- make sure you bring it back to what you are discussing
- a little hard to follow
- end when you are told.

### Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- ~~the~~ lack of consistency = point 1
  - good job taking and rejecting POI's
  - careful of contradictions
  - very good response to POI
  - slow down
  - very strong POI
- } explain the orange order

### Second Opposition

- good POI
- keep your POI short
- cut your hair, it is very distracting when you flip it around
- slow down
- very good handle of POI's.
- Don't read so much off your notes, you know your stuff



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ANDREW KAPLAN

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: English 1

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: MAN KD

Team Name: ALB PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Peter Koczanski

Peirce Dickson

Navin Kariyawasem

Noah Pinno

Score
81
100

Score
79
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score	160
	200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score	163
	200

~~PROPOSITION~~ **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

powerful platform. strong evaluation of clash. strong and well organized outline of history, uniqueness, and impact.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

lots of pointed clash. extremely well organized case. extremely effective, confident, clash.

Second Proposition

Partner well supported. some extremely valid points that needed to be emphasized rather than trying to tackle a shopping list of facts. Need to respond directly to POI's instead of dancing around the issue.

Second Opposition

extremely present in the debate. consistent & logical response to POI. well researched. could use a lot less reliance on script. could have a more organized platform, sometimes it was unclear whether you were being constructive or rebutting.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christina Orlando

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: E-1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Peter Koczanski    Pedice Dickson

Score
81
100

Score
<del>78</del>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kariyawasam    Noah Pinno

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<del>159</del>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

158
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- good use of time
- good closing example
- good organization.

- good examples in your ball down

**Second Proposition**

- make sure that when you refute, you explain why
- good passion.
- your points needed more analysis.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- ~~Good POI~~
- Good response to POI
- Try not to read your speech
- Slow down a bit so you can better articulate your words.
- good passion

good ball down

**Second Opposition**

- Good POI
- You need to try not to read your speech
- Good response to POI
- good stats to back up damage the they mcgee caused.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Marcovitch

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: English I

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Peter Kozanski

Pierre Dickson

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kargin

Mark Finn

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

162
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- good public speaker
- good points - orange order
- needed a little more content
- great QI about switching parties

**Second Proposition -**

- good refutation
- maritime point was very good

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- great points
- needed to talk about harms
- the fact that many people did the same thing was a great point

**Second Opposition**

- good ideas
- talking about harms caused by drugs
- needed better examples though GDP example cannot be proven

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Debi Ogunrinde

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: North Comp Lab

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Proposition AS

Team Name: Ontario LK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Roshan Sadhak

Nicholas Aguiar

Alnur Kassim Lakha

Javid Karim

Score
81
100

Score
<del>78</del> 78
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
158
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
155
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Wonderful speeches.  
try to be more structured when moving from point to point.  
Otherwise, good content, analysis, and use of examples.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

good speaking, try to have more substance and examples; be less repetitive  
great style & you hit some of the major ones

BOTH: defend more!

needed more general clarification of what makes a hero and who Darcy is!

be clear about what you think a hero is - actions, intentions etc need more facts!

Second Proposition

great refutation, but you do MUST rebuild. try to read more less and use more analysis, and have less points in a second speech

Second Opposition

a little hard to follow at times; try to make clear logical links

VERY GOOD style!

be a bit more organized; you have a lot of great ideas!

ALL: need better benchmarks; try also specify why you picked arguments, i.e. why someone's intentions/death etc ~~are~~ are important factors

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Karen Butt

No. of Judges: 45

Round: \_\_\_\_\_

Room: North Computer Lab

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Roshan Sadhak

Nicholas Aguiar

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario LK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Arthur Kassim Lakha

Javid Karim

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

156
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

155
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

Organization stated your points at the beginning but it's better when you highlight tell us as you're getting to each point.

**Second Proposition**

Respond better to POI's

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

good summaries

**Second Opposition**

POI in 1st gov's speech was too long

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keenan MacNeal  
Just Jadhav

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 02 Room: NS Science Lab

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba AS

Team Name: Ontario LK

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Roshan Sadhokh Micole Aguiar

Alnur Kassim Lakha Javid Karim

Score
80
100

Score
<del>77</del> <del>70</del>
100

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
157
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
155
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Use criteria  
Use a "point zero"

Second Proposition

Try to use more original clash

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Clear up what the major points of the case are

Second Opposition

Shorter POIs

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Josh Dannenbaum

No. of Judges: 5

Round: 2

Room: North 606

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AS

First Speaker:

Roshan Sadhak

Second Speaker:

Nicholas ~~Aguiar~~

Score
81
100

Score
77
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario KL

First Speaker:

Alnur Kassim Latha

Second Speaker:

Javid Karim

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
158
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
1 **First Proposition**

- good definition
  - decent signposting
  - good POI management
  - good focus on his significance to CANADA
- Well spoken,  
passionate

**Judge's Comments:**  
2 **First Opposition**

- \* no signposting - \* slow down
- hand out of pocket and you say "Right?" a lot.
- take more POI's
- good point on "hero has special status" logical flow

- shotgun method of rebuttal, more effective to boil the case down and answer question

- good signposting, 2 questions → effective
- good way to tie in that his hero status is not deserved.

3 **Second Proposition**

- need better signposting
- strong use of statistics, but are they true?
- too much time on rebutting, not enough time to construct your points which were good.
- don't get rattled by POI's

4 **Second Opposition**

- shorten POI's, be less hostile
- slow down, it will help you enunciate better
- hand out of pocket
- great points though

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Melissa Cape

No. of Judges: ~~3~~ 5

Round: 2

Room: North Computer Lab

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AS

Team Name: Ontario KL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Roshan Sadhak

Nicholas Aguiar

Alour Kassim Lakha

Javid Karim

Score
80
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

157
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

156
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Really good points.
- Good definition.

Second Proposition

- Give a bit more analysis.
- Good pacing.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Good summary speech.
- Sign post more.

Second Opposition

- Great refutation.
- Shorter POI's next time.



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isabelle Fahmy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: French 2

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: OH - Saskatchewan

Team Name: JM - Nova Scotia

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dominic Ong

Slade Hall

Harper Metler

Log Journey

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

161
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

153
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Speech was very well organized.  
Constructive points were strong.  
Perhaps take away some of the quotes to provide more evidence in support of constructive points.  
Strong rebuttal

Second Proposition

Strong clash, but you tended to repeat some of the point made by your partner.  
Overall, well organized and engaging.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

You need to work on organization of speech (road mapping) and provide more constructive points with concrete examples.

More clash needed in rebuttal.

Second Opposition

Great specific examples were referred to, but speech needs to be more organized. Introduce your points and summarize them.  
Good clash.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Price

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Fr 2

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: SASK OH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dominic Ong

Stade Hall

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA JM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Hager Metter

Ivy Journeau

Score
76
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

163
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

155
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Very good opening speech  
POIs should be brief

Good 2nd speech on  
several rebuttal points

Second Proposition

Good eye contact & speech  
but watch non-stop  
hand gestures/bouncing

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Watch the reading/eye contact  
work on passion/accents  
points

2nd speech was better  
(eye contact, points, reading)

Second Opposition

Some vague points (why he  
left Ireland?)  
watch fidgeting with left  
foot

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Loecker

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2 Room: Fr 2

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sack. Oth.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dominic ONG

Stade Hall

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: N.S. TM.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Harper Mettel.

Ivy Journey

Score
<del>77</del> <u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
<u>157</u>
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<u>158</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- well prepared
- good speaker
- try not to sound like you are giving a speech
- too many quotes, debate is not brought forward by quotes, it cuts clash.
- try not to get lost in your ideas.

**Second Proposition**

- excellent speaker
- road mapping would help to follow your speech & points.
- quotes are alright but I do not over do.

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- try to set up your side in a stronger manner
- be sure to state your points before you get into your constructive speech.
- your research did not help support your contentions
- you need to boil it down and convince the judges

**Second Opposition**

- excellent speaker
- brought forward excellent analysis - not so steeped in facts & quotes.
- used knowledge of subject to further her side.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Justin Krzywicki

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: MS-Lab

Ont. PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ont. - TR

Team Name: Saskatchewan PM.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Mr. Romeo Tello

Mr. Alexander Karp

Ms. Jillian McLeod

Ms. Leora Biakau

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<del>80</del> <u>81</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>158</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<u>157</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

hard to criticize...  
good style.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

read less ...

Second Proposition

good as well, POI very good.

Second Opposition

excellent.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jill Collins No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: MS Sci. Lab.

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: ONT-TK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Romeo Tello

Alexander Karp

Score
80
100

Score
<del>75</del> 78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan-DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julian McLeod

Leora Diakun

Score
76
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
158
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

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

High level of research, delivery, use of POI's.  
Some lapses of logic, clash

A difficult decision!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Roger Smith No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: MS science lab

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ONT-TK

Team Name: Sask DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Romeo Tello Alexander Karp

Jillian McLeod Laura Orban

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
158
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

*given in round*

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mwansa Tshimbenge

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Lucas Seminar

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: BCFD

Team Name: Quebec HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kodie Freeman Kian Draper

Isaac Harris Logan Stack

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

You're a great speaker, but have your speech all written out prevents you from really engaging in the round and speaking freely. Instead of trying to say it all word for word, try knowing the heart of your arguments really well, and just talking. Great Job!

Second Proposition

It would really help you to get out from behind your paper and be confident in what you say. You had the right ideas but if you focus more on expressing things the way you feel is right in the moment, your arguments will be more solid and clearer. But overall, good speech!

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

First off, it would be great if you just slowed down. I know you're nervous, but you have great things to say and we want to hear them all. If you slow down, you'll be easier to understand, and you'll be more confident. Good Luck!

Second Opposition

Solid speech. Good information, and I liked the reconstruction. Try and look at the core philosophical issues, and not the peripheral information.

!!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Theo McLaughlin  
Amanda Sims

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Lucas Seminar

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: BCFD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kadie Freedman      Kian Draper

Score
82
100

Score
77
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: QCHS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Isaac Harris      Logan Stack

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
159
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Focus more on the core of the debate.

Very good constructive speech, with lots of content, delivered confidently. However, there was too much appeal to authority. ~~Your~~ Your rebuttal speech could have summarized more. You focused too much on the opp's minor points & did not repair the damage on the core issue, multiculturalism.

Second Proposition

This was a smoothly delivered speech, and you responded well to opp's alcoholism and obscurity arguments. However, your response to the multiculturalism arguments — the crux of both your and opp's case — really could have used work.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Well-spoken and analytical, delivering strong content on multiculturalism. However, the alcoholism & obscurity points were considerably weaker, and you rebutted them well. Very good rebuttal speech, clearly resting on the core points at play.

Second Opposition

Very, very solid reconstruction on multiculturalism, and good new points — though the argument about McBee's inconsistency needed more analysis. Why is it a problem to change one's mind? Overall, though, a solid speech.



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kelsey Keddy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Lucas Sem.

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC - FD

Team Name: Quebec - HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kadie Freeman

Kian Draper

Isaac Harris

Logan Stack

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

155
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

You had adequate responses to POIs and arguments but you focused too much of your energy on the smaller less relevant topics. You said that the debate was about multiculturalism in your opening but failed to prove him as a hero on that basis. Great style and speaking though try to read less from paper!!

**Second Proposition**

You provided some good refutation for the round but it was not adequate to support your points. Your second point was really analysis for your first point, not something new. It was very necessary to the round!!

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

Very good point on racism and multiculturalism. You managed to really see what the round was about and you effectively refuted the prop's points. Slow down when speaking to make your points more clear. Keep in mind that you don't need to be famous to deserve to be a hero!!

**Second Opposition**

Very compelling first point. Provided new and convincing material to the round. You could use a better conclusion but your material was substantial!! Good work!!

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: DAVID WILSON

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M52

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: QUEBEC CC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

JULIAN GUILDFORD

ADRIAN GOIN

Score
77
100

Score
73
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: SK HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

CAROL HAICUT

HAROLD COSTA

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

JULIAN - FINAL REBUTTAL WAS PARTICULARLY IMPRESSIVE (UNTIL THE "NO DECEIT" COMMENT TO THE OPP).  
- CONTENT STRONG IN PLACES, BUT MAIN ARGUMENTS ONLY FRAILED

Second Proposition

BETTER GRASP OF CONTENT WOULD HAVE HELPED IN ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS THAT WERE THROWN AT YOU.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

CAROL - VERY STRONG MOVE TO ACCEPT THAT HE WAS A "GREAT" POLITICIAN, BUT NOT A HERO. ON THE OTHER HAND, THE ARGUMENT THAT HE WAS ASSASSINATED BECAUSE HE WAS VIOLENT V A BIT OFF THE WALL.

Second Opposition

GREAT POINTS OF INFORMATION.  
GOOD DELIVERY, BUT CONTENT WEAK IN PLACES, ESPECIALLY ON IMMIGRATION.  
"A FATHER OF CONFEDERATION NOT THE FATHER OF CONFEDERATION" WAS A GOOD LINE

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ryan Pistorius

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: 15-2

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec GG

Team Name: Saskatchewan HC

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Julian Guidote Adrian Goin

Caleb Haight Hannah Costa

Score
81
100

Score
75
100

Score
79
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
156
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
161
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- First speech: Very Formal; relax a little - summary was much better in this
- Forceful speaker
- Excellent final refutation
- Though "decency" part became confusing

- Strong calm, and confident speaking in first speech
- Final refutation seemed a little less so
- Good POI in regard to newspapers
- Good examples of other heroes
- Seemed like constructive might have melded into refutation a bit, or vice versa; your points seemed somewhat like refutation points

Second Proposition

- Excellent initial refutation
- Don't take all POIs (unless, obviously, they only give one; but especially don't take two immediately back-to-back)

Second Opposition

- Also strong calm, and confident speaking style
- Excellent POI: "The Montreal St. Patrick's Society hasn't accepted him back"
- Good evidence with letter calling himself a traitor
- Careful of assumptions; you could have refuted the +20% in immigration issue without referencing Irish Potato Famine

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ~~Caroline Wagner~~ Caroline Wagner

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: MS 2

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec GG

Team Name: SK HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julian Guedote

Adrian Goin

Caleb Haight

Hannah Costa

Score
<del>77</del> 77
100

Score
73
100

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

150
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Proposition**

Good definition

Strong final speech — just not quite enough to win the round

Lack of convincing content

Also here

**Second Proposition**

Don't take as many pois

take your time to respond to them  
or don't take them if you're not confident with what you're saying

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Opposition**

Good case line & constructive.

**Second Opposition**

Great pois & confident speaker  
good material  
try not to read as much

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ~~Alberta~~ Elizabeth Winsor No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: MS4

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - FM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
79
100

Score
74
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia JM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tia Huttemann

Kevin Jacobs

Score
81
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

153
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

RFD

- good analysis about why Darcie McGee should be praised for ~~achievements~~ accomplishments, missing the link for why this makes him a hero.

speaker comments

- very eloquent, organized
- be careful about interrupting opponents ...

Second Proposition

- a bit disorganized
- good, clear knowledge of topic

note: could use better explanation of why John, A. MacDonald should be a hero to use this as justification

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

RFD

excellent description of why his personal traits made him not a hero

speaker comments

- great preparation → well organized
- ↳ could use better roadmaps

Second Opposition

- great recovery from P.O. I. after new
- excellent description of alcoholic problems, why it's not heroic
  - ↳ good refutation
  - ↳ good thinking on your feet

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Dan Ton-Thak

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: MS-4

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta FM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
79
100

Score
<del>74</del> 74
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC JH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tia Hutteman

Kevin Jacobs

Score
81
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

153
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

### Judge's Comments:

#### First Proposition

Don't be too aggressive yet solid  
2nd POI → and other on 2nd  
Opp speaker  
Good arguments

→ focus on personal life not being  
such a factor in being a "hero",

→ Good PMR → strengthened

→ Very good devel. on partners points well

#### Second Proposition

Solid refutation

Good arguments → well developed +  
explained

Weak response to POI about  
ex: of what he did

Prop: Is a hero defined by  
personal life or contributions  
[bring up Billy Bishop!]

### Judge's Comments:

#### First Opposition

→ Solid argument, good job furthering the  
following thought argument.

→ Only rebut stronger arguments but  
good refutation

→ Good POI! (Alcoholism)

→ Good rebuttal but could've focused  
on 2 main pillars of debate

1) Personal life factors into "hero"

2) What he did wasn't full ✓

#### Second Opposition

→ Good response to POI

→ 2nd argument wasn't as convincing  
as #4.

→ explain how making him a hero  
affects society → further arg.  
to make it more relevant.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julie Hooton

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M4

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta FM.

First Speaker:

Bryan Ma

Second Speaker:

Jeremy Fan

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia JH.

First Speaker:

Tia Huttemann

Second Speaker:

Kevin Jacobs

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>153</u>
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<u>162</u>
200

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

### Judge's Comments:

#### First Proposition

organization was good. Definition of 'hero' could have been more developed.

2 arguments (free nation, shared Canada) - well-presented & considered.

Good summary of his points

Notes - good presentation skills but relied on notes more than I would like to see.

Be careful in using POI.

Good summary - should pass on of beliefs.

#### Second Proposition

Addressed points made by opp well.

Effective in presentation of "protect the nation argument" but lots of details on the Finian uprising - ~~but~~ need more on McGee here.

(good summary of 3 pts; following key structures)

### Judge's Comments:

#### First Opposition

not clear enough on <sup>all</sup> organizational elements but rebuttals were well done and two arguments were well-presented. (I like how defined 'hero' & then showed how McGee did not meet the definition)

Good POIs.

Summary - well-presented

Confident speaker

#### Second Opposition

Clearly passionate about his arguments & raised good ideas.

got a little sidetracked by POIs but came back well to his point & pulled it out.

(Try not to use notes too much.)

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Emanuel Simon

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: MS-3

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario 26

First Speaker:

Catherine Zheng

Second Speaker:

Rannak Gera

Score
<del>84</del> 84
100

Score
81
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: (NS) MD

First Speaker:

Brie Dukeshire

Second Speaker:

Matthew Machum

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

165
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

164
200

PROPOSITION X OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Spoke too fast
- used word "like" too much
- well-organized
- great rebuttals at the end
- great example (John A. McDonald)
- could use better style

Second Proposition

- Made good points
- Too emotional while not speaking.  
(sitting)
- comfortable speaking

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Poised speaker
- did not make enough strong points
- very good style
- good example (abandonment of American  
Irish)
- could have used more hard evidence
- ~~and~~ missed opportunity to refute  
certain major proposition points.

Second Opposition

- Good example use (forged letters)
- Good major points
- missed opportunities to poke holes  
in proposition arguments



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tarang Marathe

No. of Judges: \_\_\_\_\_ Round: 2 Room: MS-3

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario - ZG

Team Name: Nova Scotia - MD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Zheng

Raunak Gera

Brix Dukeshire

Matthew Mocham

Score
84
100

Score
84
100

Score
82
100

Score
85
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score	168
	200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score	167
	200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Try to read a little less
- Great points
- Take POI's more often
- Excellent road mapping + definition
- **EXCELLENT REBUTTAL**

- Good introduction
- In your refutation, be sure to attack ALL their points.
  - Refutation requires deeper analysis
- WHY is it important that he was inconsistent.
- Rebuttal was slightly repetitive.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

- Clearer roadmapping required
- Don't waste too much time on a POI; don't repeat yourself.
- You need more time for refutation

- Very impressive speech + style.
- Again, deal with their strongest points directly.
- Your point was slightly similar to your partners, perhaps distinguish them more.

+ deeper refutation **VERY, VERY CLOSE ROUND**

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MARZ LAZAR

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2 Room: MS3

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario ZG

Team Name: Nova Scotia MD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Zheng RAUNAK GERA

Brie Dukeshire Matthew Machure

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

164
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

163
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

~~Great~~ Arguments + Prep  
too much reading  
and leaning on table

Good rebut & much more  
~~easy~~ comfort w/o reading  
too many "like" -  
Good establishment of  
many points = here

Second Proposition

too much "action" -  
pounding table, etc  
Good presentation and  
comfort when speaking  
nice refutation -

Plus P. Rebut

Did not pick up on  
"nitpicked his brain...  
within his mind" by opp.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Best Speaking Presence -  
Comfort - ease of  
understand argument  
- "1 Trick Pony" - too  
focused on "Irish case"  
only - not enough to say he  
was accomplished all because  
"self serving"

Second Opposition

Good P&I responses  
Interesting argument  
re fraud, etc  
need evidence to show  
how it supports your  
position.  
Good speaking style

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: W. BARLYK

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2 Room: SPEARS

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: QUEBEC DV

Team Name: ONT. YZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karla Valentini N. Boris de Stefano

Lofan Ye David Zhao

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

Score
84
100

Score
<del>85</del> 83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

163
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

167
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Excellent speech, well-spoken
- Ideas clearly outlined
- Sound historical background in presentation
- Spiritually excellent and good arguments

Second Proposition

- Competent in his presentation but average in main speech
- Minor mistakes from an historical perspective

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Excellent rebuttal to the point and soundly justified
- Spoke well & clearly and confident of his ideas and presentation
- Relevant arguments

Second Opposition

- Speech generally quite good
- Good points of information
- Spoke a little too rapidly and at times difficult to understand
- Good analysis of the points

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ahmad Nehmiz

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Speirs Seminar

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karla Valentini

Nikolas Destefano

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario YZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Ye

David Zhao

Score
86
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
162
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
169
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- Real good job outlining the case.
- Drop the paper!
- Good points and examples.
- You got caught on the pol about why he is special!
- In your summary speech make sure to ~~address~~ refute and don't just repeat your points; framing the speech with questions might help.

**Second Proposition**

- For your first points talk about why it's a revolutionary idea at the time.
- The second point is the same as the first speaker?
- Your refutation was all right.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- Great counter-definition.
- slow down a bit
- Examples were perfect to illustrate the analysis.
- Nice summary speech

**Second Opposition**

- Structure your analysis a bit more.
- Awesome refutation and rebuilding.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caroline Mei

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Sp 103 seminar

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

Team Name: Ontario YZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kara Valentini

Nikolas de stefano

Logan ye

David Zhao

Score
81
100

Score
79
100

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

$\frac{81}{79}$   
160

Team Score

160
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

165
200

$\frac{83}{82}$   
165

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Overall, an excellent round. The round went to opposition; opp was a hero really well (in terms of ret good, Gov. had good constructive, but why McCre's specific actions were Gov's summary speech could also have been organized into themes. All speakers have very clear, articulate style. Good job and good luck



Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

very well grounded in historical fact. able to frame the criteria for being inspiration, intentions). Good job. we wanted to hear more on a diving core behind the results. in the future!

Second Opposition

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alexandra Mazzella

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: MS-1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: NOVA Scotia FJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Friesen      Alex Jackson

Score
77
100

Score
71
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

AZAN ESMAIL      SAMIR ESMAIL

Score
73
100

Score
73
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

148
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

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

COMMENTS GIVEN ORALLY

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nico Vit

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: HS-1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Friesen                      Alex Jackson

Score
78
100

Score
71
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Azan Esmail                      Samir Esmail

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

149
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

148
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- Define better
- slow down pitch
- Be clearer on points
- Decent PMA, sum up debate more

**Second Proposition**

- Nervous
- Good points
- strong railroad point, give more detail
- POC

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- Good Structure
- More varied points
- Don't read.
- Fehian point weak
- good speaking style

**Second Opposition**

- Don't read
- well structured
- could have expanded much more on fehian act

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: A. Martin

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: 151

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Nova Scotia FS

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Anna Friesen Alex Jackson

Grant Comrie Jamie Comrie

Score
79
100

Score
72
100

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
151
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
148
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Well organized.  
very good arguments  
need to slow down  
v. good response to  
P.O.I.  
v. good tie in of arguments  
to definition of hero.  
needed to discuss  
"tension" point  
need to ask more P.O.I.'s  
**TIMING!!**

Second Proposition

v. good response to P.O.I.  
Try not to be so  
repetitive.  
need to refute all  
op. points.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

try not to read speech.  
needed more clash.  
very clear diction.  
v. good final sum up.

Second Opposition

Try not to read speech.  
v. good sum up