

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ABRAHAM MOUSSAKO

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

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario LK

Team Name: Nova Scotia MD

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Alnur Kossim Latha Said Karim

Brie Dukeshire Matt Machum

Score
81
100

Score
89
100

Score
84
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
962
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
104
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
 First Proposition Alnur Kossim Latha
 SPEAKING GOOD, LOGICAL
 STRUCTURE, BUT ACTUAL
 ARGUMENTATION COULD HAVE BE
 - EN BETTER

Judge's Comments:
 First Opposition Brie Dukeshire
 GREAT POINTS, UNWINDING PROBLEMS
 W/ PROP CASE

Second Proposition David Karim
 SEE ABOVE

Second Opposition Matt Machum
 CARRIED OVER PARTNER'S POINTS

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kaylann Knickle

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: 4c.1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Leora Diakuw

Jillian McLeod

Score
86
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Brit. Columbia SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Samantha Starkey

Holden Beggs

Score
88
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
168
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Excellent speaker.
- Control point, imploring to vote = good points. (In general → substantive)
- Excellent job at boiling down the debate.
- Shame to have a speaker this great with a time issue → flesh out your points fully; combine real world examples & theoretical/philosophical concepts.

Second Proposition

- Beginnings of great content. Keep working on your confidence and structure and you'll improve with time.
- Nice voice.
- Please raise POIs.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Phenomenal speaker.
- Excellent, on-point POIs. (Try to slow down when you ask them to prevent the occasional stumble)
- Great questions (debate boiled down) at in final opp speech.

Second Opposition

- Great speaker → great speaking manner, easy to listen to, great vocabulary.
- Great POIs.
- Lost a bit of structure mid-way through. If you're responding to unstructured opp points → structure them in response. Will raise your score.
- Eliminate repetitiveness to hit next level.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: A. Martini

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: 2C-5

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec KZ

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

~~Athena~~ ^{Khalid}

Maria Zimmerman

A. Esmail

S. ESMAIL

Score
73
100

Score
75
100

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
148
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Need to frame debate -
what is Fundamental Issue?
Too short.

Try not to say "um"

Second Proposition

Well organized.
Need more depth/evidence

Try not to sway.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Strong arguments.
Reply speech very repetitive.

Second Opposition

Arguments are assumptions.
Need some evidence.

"Kids" is slang.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Allison Bender

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: 3B4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia JM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Harper Metler

Fuy Jurnea

Score
75
100

Score
70
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia JH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kevin Jacobs

Tia Huttemann

Score
69
100

Score
69
100

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

Team Score

145
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

136
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

Hit most important point (freedom of religion) and made some attempts to develop and explain it. Avoided taking explicit stance that ^{parents} children should be allowed to deny treatment even if child's life is endangered - had to assume it.

Second Proposition

Some good refutation. Didn't fill time. Needed more development of parental responsibility point.

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

Points were somewhat irrelevant and assumed resolution meant allowing potentially dangerous religious medical treatments. Did not fill time.

Second Opposition

Points were more relevant but did not fully develop rights point. Had good example of child dying as result of untreated heart defect.

All speakers - Ask why and be more confident.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. Valerianos

No. of Judges: 3

Round: _____

Room: 3B.2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SK-SM

Team Name: ALBERTA-6K

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ahmedeen Salim Layha Mounir Swish Goswami Ashish KC

Score
71
100

Score
72
100

Score
77
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
143
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

* Debate should be about rights of humans.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

* Focus more on human rights. Use more vivid examples
~~* too much preamble~~

Second Proposition

See above.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Denis Bault

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3B-2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask. Sm

Team Name: Alberta GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ahmeren Sahim Layla Moomin

Swish Goswami Ashish KC

Score
71
100

Score
74
100

Score
77
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
145
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: Ahmeren
First Proposition

Good pace in delivery
You didn't speak on the issue of religious beliefs
Your rebuttal contained some contradictions (eg. doctors know what is best for children, but not for every child)

Second Proposition Layla

You stated an assumption (parents will choose rationally), but you earlier connected emotion with the right decision

Judge's Comments: Swish
First Opposition

Good PoI (on knowwagig) (medical needs @)
You didn't say why religious beliefs (at first) are not to be considered
You addressed it later through but with example from outside the context of the debate (Canada)

Second Opposition Ashish

Good speech
Strong points
You brought the debate back into the context of parental rights on religious beliefs

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Roger Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3B2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK-SM

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Shroven Sabir

Layla Moosmin

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Swish Roseani

Ashish KC

Score
72
100

Score
73
100

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
145
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
154
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kaylann Knickle

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: 3B.4

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia JM

Team Name: Manitoba HR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Harper Metler

Ivy Journeay

Yael Ripstein

Sophie Hershfield

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
88
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score
154
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
170
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great speaking style.
- Arguments needed work.
- Define status quo. Paint us a picture / some form of narrative.

- Great rebuttal
- Great reasoning
- Added level of sophistication in terms of analysis to the case
- Things to work on:
 - Paint us a picture
 - Burden of proof (what do they need to tell us to win?)
 - Variation in speaking style.

Please keep debating!!

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

- Again, great speaking style. You complimented your partner nicely.

- Superb POI on the deterrent effect of existing drug testing. Slippery slope argument less strong.
- Excellent delivery on POIs
- Really great speaker overall. Good structure. Strong argumentation. Keep doing what you're doing!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christina Orlando

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 4

Room: 3D.23

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC FD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kian Draper

Kodie Freeman

Score
72
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Oreofe Okunnu

Miriam Currali

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score

147
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

153
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- more analysis need
- good clear speaker
- good POI
- although the other team only addressed extremes, you needed to address what would happen in those extreme cases.

Second Proposition

- good chemo example
- good logical clear speaker
- careful about making too many assumptions.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good roadmapping.
- good passion
- good blood transfusion example
- good refutation
- good passion
- try to respond directly to POI's.
- your point about the child not necessarily having the same views should have been more developed.

Second Opposition

- good passion
- good refutation.
- more analysis needed.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Carol St. Gelais

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 4

Room: 3D.23

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC FO

First Speaker:

Kiam Draper

Second Speaker:

Kadie Freeman

Score
72
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GO

First Speaker:

Oreife Okumu

Second Speaker:

William Gurd

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score
147
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
153
200

PROPOSITION / ~~OPPOSITION~~

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition *Interesting set up take less time on intro.
Clear speaking style, engaging, walked us through it.
Mitigation of possible risks*

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition *Very clear set up, road map.
Great refutation
Better summary, more crystallization rather than refutation*

Second Proposition

*Good refutation, logically followed
More analysis on freedom of religion
for that to be a strong point*

Second Opposition

*Better organization, identify refutation & constructive more clearly
Refutation was good, great point on balancing rights claims
parent vs child*

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: TAYLOR STEELE

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4 ^{2nd round Saturday} Room: 4E.1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KD

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Peter Kozanski Pierce Dickson

Score
82
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia DW

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Elizabeth Duff Marcus Wilmott

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score	159
	200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score	154
	200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Stylistically strong, bit of a tendency to appeal to Canadian values without a "why". Talked about what you had to, reply was a bit disorganized. Some odd statements ("harms a number of other people" rather than just one), otherwise fine.

Second Proposition

Rebuilding needs to be more than restating. Provide support, the "why". Some interesting new ideas, go further. (Why religion is important - good!)

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Maybe more nuanced case, outline the different actors and analyze rather than state rights. It's not enough to stand for life, and some of what you said worked against you. Harms need to come out in your speech.

Don't make broad generalizations about what religion means to people without backing.

Second Opposition

Be more structured, make rebuttal and constructive clear. Much more analysis beyond "life comes first" -> why? Some odd statements, like how it's okay for adults, without the link.

Everyone: Talk about more than blood transfusions. LINK THE "IS" TO THE "WHY", especially w/ rights

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: HAMISH GUTHRIE

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: 3F.43

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NSRF

Team Name: NSFJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

RDY FLYNN

MATIEA ROACH

ANYA FRIESEN

ALEX JACKSON

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

168
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

A good, clear statement of the case, strong structure, manner, delivery.
On the strongest points opp. raised, such as honour killings for religious reasons, there might be even stronger rebuttals.
Second Proposition

Strong manner, delivery.
Some good rebuttals. I would have been engaged and involved in the debate throughout.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

My main suggestion is to begin clash, engagement, earlier with more POs during PM's first speech.
Raise the main contention earlier.
Question their analysis earlier.

Second Opposition

Take POs when you are ready and comfortable, when you are is well set.
You were feeling towards some very good arguments that I wanted to hear more on - eg. honour killings case.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caroline Mei

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: SBB

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC-GG

Team Name: MB-HR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julian Guidde Adrian Goia

Sophie Herschfield Yael Ripstein

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

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

77
76
153

Team Score

153
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

80
79
159

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:
First Proposition**

**Judge's Comments:
First Opposition**

This was a good debate. Both teams had the right points and themes in the round.

However, opposition did a better job crystallizing the debate down to its fundamental question of religious tolerance vs. saving lives.

Gov: I needed to hear more about why parents had absolute right and authority over their children's bodies.

Good job everyone with POIs - very well given, interesting and contributive.

Second Proposition

Gov: work on using more examples.

Opp: examples do not need to be framed in such a dramatic fashion.

Second Opposition

Good luck w/ the rest of the tournament and in future!



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aung Mya Kyaw

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: Oliver's

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Roshan Sodhak

Nicholas Aguilar

Score
73
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emil Stanca

Zaid Salabeen

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

148
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

154
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- * Good rebuttal in summary speech
- * Summarize in your summary. Break the debate down to 3 themes or question.
- * Good model
- * Don't rely too much on examples

Second Proposition

- * Good rebuilding of partner's points
- * Good rebuttal
- * Some of your constructive points are the same as your partner's. For example, tolerate religion, parents know best. They are not new points.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- * Good rebuttal
- * Good justification of why medicine is one area religion cannot enter
- * In your summary speech, make more themes or questions to break down the round.

Second Opposition

- * Very good points on morality and choice.
- * Rebuttal of 2nd proposition's material was good.
- * Also spend some time on rebuilding your partner's points

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tracey Lee

No. of Judges: 3 Junior Round: 4 Room: 3A7

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CS

Team Name: Alberta - FM

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Riley Cohen Foster Salpeter

Bryan Ma Jeremy Fan

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
160
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

You had good points, try to work on structure and clarity - at times you seemed a bit uncertain/hesitant about where your arguments were going

Nice opening, a good job challenging the prop assumptions & clarifying the group that we're talking about, although it may have been to your advantage to tighten the range of "children"

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Great job crystallizing the arguments and illustrating the flaws in the prop case. You brought good clarity to the areas of clash.

More focus on the areas of clash - ✓ good. Your constructive point created tension in a case that you claimed was a matter of choice v. religion.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katrine Doganoglu

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 4 Room: 3A7

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CS

Team Name: Alberta-FM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Riley Cohen

Foster Salpeter

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
78 78
100

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

159
159
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- make sure to define what you mean by "children" or "child"
- good arguments + structure of speech.
- I would have liked to have ~~heard~~ heard more analysis on why right to religion should supersede the right to life.
- both speakers were well structured + well delivered.

Second Proposition

- be careful with contradictions → at one point you said some people value right to religion over life itself, but then you said that if it's a life or death situation, parents will ultimately decide to save their child.
- otherwise - nice organization + structure of speech
- your argument was good, but I think there are stronger arguments for why right to religion is so important (other than mosaic idea)

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- nice opening + nice job laying out your arguments.
- would have liked to have seen more refutation on why consent of child does not matter.
- would have liked more structure in your summary speech (eg. 3 themes or questions)

Second Opposition

- your argument about child's right to choose religion is a bit of a contradiction because of your ~~clash~~ clash about parents right to religion. This ultimately muddled your case.
- ~~my rebuttal~~

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marie Ouellet

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3A7

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Québec CS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Riley Cohen

Foster Salpeter

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: FM - Alberta

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>162</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>151</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good links btwn both arguments + speakers gave your debate a good flow + cohesion.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good ~~defini~~ observation that "children" had not been defined
- some contradictions in arguments
- very pertinent questions

Second Proposition

- excellent crystallization brought the debate back to the question of rights and put it in your favour
- some arguments were weakened by examples.

Second Opposition

- good rebuttals
- pointed out contradictions in oppositions arguments.
- would have liked for your argument to have been further developed.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sophia Nass

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3A4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl

Nikolas

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC DJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Safir

Amalak

Score
77
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

154
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- More focus on parental rights & how much freedom they have to decide for children ~~more analysis~~
- interesting point on right to religion, but more analysis needed on why this supersedes the child's right to life (both speakers)

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- More ~~focus~~ ^{analysis} on how/when government restricts rights (specifically when they harm others)
- more focus on the fact that this deals with children, not someone deciding for themselves ~~both speakers~~
- Good point on the role of the government to protect, but more analysis on how this relates to the motion (protecting children - who can't ~~protect~~ protect themselves) (both speakers)

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. Litewich

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3A4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec - DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valentini

Nikolas De Stefan

Score
75
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC - DJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Safir Jazayeri

Amolak Singh Dhillon

Score
76
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score

153
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Be careful with constitutional argument
- What is "the Christian Church"?
- S2 freedom religion
- S1 limits
- Need to talk about children

Rebuttal

- More Moderator
- Case is about choice
- Way stronger rebuttal

Second Proposition

- Finally! Talking about children!
- not okay to harm others
- unless children?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- overused "address gentlemen"
- Need to focus on making decisions for kids.
-

Rebuttal

- comes down to hygiene
- "save Canada" hyperbole

Second Opposition

- Excellent "restrict freedoms to preserve others"
- then hypothesis "is this democracy?" ??

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ahmad Mehme

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3A4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valentini

Nikolas Destefan

Score
75
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-DJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Safir Jazayeri

Arnold Singh Dhillon

Score
76
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

- Your points weren't relevant because it was mostly about children and not individuals!
- Very good PMR but the important issues came out too late

Second Proposition

- style point: talk to us, not the opposition
- secular society doesn't imply not respecting on each others freedoms.
- Parents are in the best position! YES!!!

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Childrens can't get Parkinsons :)
- Again your points are about individuals and not children.
- Very good rebuttal though

Second Opposition

- Your argument was misinterpreted; it's about children's rights not Health Care
- Few cases don't justify not doing anything about it.
- Parents not always sensible !!! YES!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Cukier

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 4 Room: 3'

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~ONT~~ ~~OK~~ SK OH

Team Name: ONT TK.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dominic Ong

Slade Hall

Alex Karp

Romeo Tello

Score
78
100

Score
79.
100

Score
80
100

Score
80.
100

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

Team Score
157.
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
160.
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: Ong
First Proposition

- not always clear; need to get to point more clearly
- very good closing comments
- use reference to Charter needs to be elaborated

Second Proposition Hall

- good speaker
- didn't have distinct argument

Judge's Comments: Karp
First Opposition

- good response to POI.
- refuted well

Second Opposition Tello

- refuted well

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caitlin Danielson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3A.6

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan OH

Team Name: Ontario TK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dominic Ong

Glade Hall

Alexander Karp

Romeo Jello

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

157
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Great opening and confidence!
Make sure you clearly outline your points beyond the first roadmap and look for any rights that might be missing.

Second Proposition

Great speaking style!
Try to explain exactly WHY certain rights exist.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great reputation!
Next time try to get the important rights analysis out immediately.

Second Opposition

Good speech, great opening
make sure you finish outlining your points after P015

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Daniel Del Balso

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2nd day

Room: 3A-C

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan - OH

Team Name: ONT - TK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dominic Ong

Slade Hall

Alexander Kap

Monica Tello

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

753
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

756
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Not bad, good speaker!
- Points were not properly discussed, focus on the rights of the parents → wig? don't just state these things.

Second Proposition

Excellent speaker but points were not elaborated in terms of the rights etc. involved.

Word use (both):
diagnosis ≠ treatment.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- No need to be nervous!
- Excellent first two POIs.
- Try to organize speech more effectively, stick to a roadmap. Party became muddled.

Second Opposition

Amazing speaker. Discussed more concrete ideas about rights etc.

• don't be rude about POIs
don't wave at people, say "no thank you" and don't wave them down while speaking!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CAROLINE WAGNER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4 Room: 3A.9

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario - ZG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Zheng

Raunak Gera

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario - YZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Ye

David Zhou

Score
80 82
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

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Way too low burden a case.
We're not arguing about not giving your kids Tylenol → that's already OK.
- Don't say "like" as much

Second Proposition

- Don't say "right" as much

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Point out it's low burden!
- Good speaker

Second Opposition

- Don't stand up as much
it's distracting
- Slow down

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alexandra Mazzella

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3A.9

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario ZG

Team Name: Ontario YZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Zheng Raunak Geyz

Logan Ye David Zhao

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
81
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score
134
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
158
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Given Orally

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kate Rochford

No. of Judges: 3

Round:

Room: 3A.9

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario ZG

Team Name: Ontario YZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Zheng

Raunak Gera

Logan Ye

David Zhao

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Score
82
100

Score
79
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

Pet Peeves:

- very narrow terms

Second Proposition

Pet Peeve:

- slow down
- don't repeat rounds

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Pet Peeves:

- flesh out your points
- keep asking "why? what?"

Second Opposition

Pet Peeve:

- don't POI every 40 seconds, right
down your POI
- time management

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Bailey Kay

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3B.15

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec HS

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Isaac Harris

Logan Stock

Narvir Karjaneesan

Noah Pinno

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Score
84
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score

152
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- missed some of the key issues in the debate
- some wrong assertions
- a lot of assertions, needed more analysis
- was a strong presenter

Second Proposition

- made less assertions than partner
- some contributions to the round in 1st speaker

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- strong speech
- good points
- got the main idea of the round / had a strong argument

Second Opposition

- brought in examples
- strengthened partner's points

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Brian Coyle

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3615

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec HS.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Isaac Harris

Logan Stack

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Albion PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kariyankand

Navin Pinn

Score
<u>84</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>165</u>
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Wait to take POI until
conclusion.
Why does freedom trump care?

Second Proposition

Pleasant Speaker

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

[good POI re child's rights vs
Parents]
Dependent on note.

Second Opposition

long POI
dependent on note.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mark Pedman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: ^{Jr.} 4

Room: 30.2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: \$K HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Hannah Costa

Caleb Harght

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Janie Denham

Score
86
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and 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

Tight definition - motion calls for restriction, not just choice

Deeper analysis of why we have a right to religion was needed

Second Proposition

Good analysis - take it a step further and say spiritual harms trump physical harms

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Awesome PMR, but it should have come out in the opening speech

Second Opposition

Don't take 2 POI's in a row. If you missed what they said, so did the judges.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Veeru

No. of Judges: 3

Round: ^(3r)4

Room: 3d2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Hannah Costa

Calab Haight

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC OS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jaime Denham

Score
85
100

Score
79
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

- ↳ clear stance
- ↳ correct broad areas of analysis, both in 1st speech and rebuttal
- ↳ Be more specific in arguments taking the time back to why this specific meta should work
- ↳ fill time!

Second Proposition

- ↳ good development of argument
- ↳ more deep clarity → clear and mostly effective
- ↳ Great job taking specifically about religiosity regarding dialogue et.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- ↳ Great job!
- ↳ stuff in rebuttal very excellent, but somewhat over ideal to use in the 1st speech
- ↳ Less use of rhetorical questions!

Second Opposition

- ↳ less points accepted
- ↳ good support of position!
- ↳ last line wasn't terribly new
- ↳ Broder & MofE clear
- ↳ Good rebuilding

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon Hoyt-Helbett

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3D-2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Hannah Costa

Caleb Haight

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie Denham

Score
85
100

Score
79
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

- ① watch your definitions maintain the spirit of the debate.
- ↳ "multiple choices" combined debate

- Well done -

Second Proposition

- Great use of POI's
- Strong clash
- Link evidence to specific pillars
↳ general info, needed to be specific

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great Reply speech - these points should have been raised in your 1st speech to add weight.
- Strong & passionate delivery

Second Opposition

- Use POI's to demonstrate engagement → NO POI's offered
- Great "signposting" to open speech.