

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kayllan

No. of Judges: \_\_\_\_\_ Round: \_\_\_\_\_ Room: SB.16

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta-FM

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

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec-GG

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

Julian Guidote Adrian Goin

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>151</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<u>149</u>
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Clear speaker; confident
- Definitionally, this debate was flawed from the outset

Second Proposition

- Good content → needs further structure, needs development

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Good POI on enforcement.
- Don't let POI stand that long.

Second Opposition

- Raise POIs!
- Good calm, authoritative speaking style

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Cynthia Simo

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3D.2

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario LK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alnur Kassim

Javid Kanim

Score
77
100

LAKHA

Score
76
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: SK OH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Slade Hall

Deminic Ong

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score

153
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

→ flush out your arguments more.

Second Proposition

Handle POI's better (don't get so hustled).

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

flush out your arguments more

Second Opposition

- divide your points better
- Be careful of contradictions between you and your partner.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keenan MacNeal

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3D2

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario HK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alnur Kassim Lakha

Javid Karim

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan OH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Slade Hall

Dominic Ong

Score
76
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score

156
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Cleaner model

~~More analysis~~

Second Proposition

More clash

For everyone  
More analysis + links  
More POIs  
More clash  
Set targets for arguments  
\* Think about actors

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Less econ. (not always relevant)

Second Opposition

Deeper rights analysis  
Don't LO dump!

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lisen Bassett

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3D.2

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario GK

Team Name: Saskatchewan OH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alnur Kassim Larna      Javid Karim

Slade Hall      Dominic Ong

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
153
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
150
200

**PROPOSITION** / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- ~~Careful about making counter-arguments~~
- Good refutation of their 'rights' point and good refutation overall but be sure to leave time to sum up your own arguments.
- watch how quickly you speak. Your points were good but sometimes a little hard to follow because they were going by so quickly

**Second Proposition**

- You didn't leave enough time to refute the points but your constructive arguments were well put.

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- Good outline of your cases at the beginning but be sure to follow the outline you give (at some points it was unclear if you were refuting or not).

**Second Opposition**

- Left the main argument for this last speech, which didn't give the other side much time to say anything
- Good amount of POI's given & taken
- Good speaking speed

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aung Mya Kyaw

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: SB-13

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia JH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kevin Jacobs

Tia Huttermann

Score
73
100

Score
75
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valentini

Nikolas De Stefano

Score
77
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
148
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- \* Make a clever model; include age limit
  - \* Good constructive point
  - \* However, have at least 2 constructive points, 1 is not enough. Don't leave it to your partner
  - \* In your summary speech, break the debate into themes/questions, 2 or 3 of them
- Second Proposition**

- \* I like your Tom Watkins example, but be careful, don't generalize
- \* I like the "military develops essential skills" point
- \* Your rebuttal was a bit weak. You didn't refute their "Canada is democratic" and "no need" points

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- \* I like your "rights over duties" point
  - \* Good rebuttal
  - \* Say harms instead of "no need". Take a stronger stance
  - \* Summarize the round into themes ~~and~~ or questions in your summary speech.
- Second Opposition**

- \* Very good rebuttations. They were point by point. They were easy to follow and organized
- \* I also like "benefit does not mean mandatory" point

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BRIAN CASH

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3-D23

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MB - HR

Team Name: SK - SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sophie Hershenfeld Yael Ripstein

Layla Mounir Ahmed Salim

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

Score
85
100

Score
86
100

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

Team Score
161
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
171
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*Good slow control*

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*Good use of POI  
Clear Country Presence  
heavily display of strategy*

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alexandra Mazzei

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3D-23

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: MB - HR

Team Name: Sk - SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sophie Hershfield Yael Ripstein

Layla Moumin Ahmereen Salim

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Score
87
100

Score
86
100

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

Team Score
158
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
173
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:** Good Eye contact and poise  
**First Proposition** well done taking/answering POIs.  
Good Roadmapping and definition

1) insurance of safety ✓

2) Where it has worked ✓

Israel - service for both genders

• watch out for giving POIs in protected time.

• Good voice

Summary + Rebuttal

Good work with Summary + Rebuttal.  
Try to focus on both.

**Second Proposition**

• Good work taking POIs. (try to take 2 and give 2)

#1) Better Prepared

Safety to Canada + Problems in world -  
Explain how....

WW2 Example →

#2) How the military works.

You speak well, but you need to explain your points more thoroughly

Overall - your points were well noted and interesting to listen to!

**Judge's Comments:** Good job attempting + giving POIs  
**First Opposition** well done. Answering POIs.  
Preparing for war leads to war ~~introduction~~ Good introduction + narrowing in on the point!  
#1) necessary → Do we need this for Canada?

Many people don't want this  
Your point is well explained and detailed.  
With appropriate ~~examples~~ examples.

#2) Causing Problems ✓

well done / developed  
Great voice all the way through!

Refutation → Good points about other countries.

Israel - well defended point!

Summary + Rebuttal Good Questions to summarize and well explained.

Well done overall! Continue debating!

**Second Opposition**

Good work giving/attempting POIs. (answering them so well)

Refutation → You dissected the Govt's points well!

• Good rebuttal on non-existing threat + no benefits for society.

• well explained + clear

Try to spend a little more time on your point (there were only 2 minutes left when you started)

Point → Counterproductivity → well explained.

Summary was concise and to the point

Overall your debate was absolutely fantastic!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Daniel del Balso

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2<sup>nd</sup> the day Room: 3d. 23

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - HR

Team Name: Saskatchewan - SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sophie Hersheyfield

Yael Pipstein

Layla Mounir

Ahmedeen Safim

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Score
86
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score

158
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

170
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Very good speaker.
  - Very well presented definitions well set-up!
  - Good roadmapping.
- ↓  
↑ Try to take five more POIs!
- Second Proposition
- Good roadmapping.
  - Relevant POI good
  - Preparedness was ~~not~~ brought up a bit too often. Make point clearer.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Excellent.
- A brilliant speech (both).
  - Points were debated on principle.
- ~~POIs were not relevant.~~  
POIs: Very good, relevant.
- Second Opposition
- Also excellent.
- Make sure you ~~are~~ have more time to present your arguments after such a thorough reputation.



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ABRAMAM MOVSEPOD

No. of Judges: ~~3~~ 1 Round: 5 Room: 7CS

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Saskatchewan DM

Team Name: Manitoba - GO

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Leora Diukun Jillian Mcleod

Oreofe Okunnu Mariam Guindi

Score
<del>82</del> 82
100

Score
79
100

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
161
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
163
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition LEORA O.  
BROUGHT FORTH GOOD POINTS BUT  
ANALYSIS NOT DEEP ENOUGH

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition OREOFFE O.  
GOOD POINTS FWD, CLOSING  
GOV.

Second Proposition

JILLIAN M.  
WENT ABOVE, CLOSING OVER POINTS

Second Opposition

MARIAM G.  
LIKEWISE, BUT DEBATE WAS  
ARGUMENT NOT THE BEST.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon Hoyt-Halbert

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: 3B.4

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec K2

Team Name: B.C. - FD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Athina Khalid

Maria Zimmermann

Katie Freeman

Kian Draper

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

Score
82
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

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Be careful to define the terms as intended - your team definition was very narrow.

- You could have used more examples to help fill your time.

Well done!

Second Proposition

Good refutation, but don't take more than 2 POI's

- more examples would help strengthen case lines

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Great use of POI's  
- Strong refutation  
- Good case construction

Good Job!

Second Opposition

- Great style & delivery - passion  
- Strong clash & refutation

- Be sure to accept POI's  
↳ waved down 3 accepted none

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christina Orlando

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3A.6

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS-MD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brie Dukeshire

Matt Machum

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS-FJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Friesen

Alex Jackson

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>84</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>164</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<u>168</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- good intro
- great speaking style
- great analysis.

good Finland example.

**Second Proposition**

- excellent rebutting
- good analysis of your point.
- good refutation

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- excellent refutation
- good "let's say" scenarios

excellent ball down  
↳ good job bringing up the important themes.

**Second Opposition**

- good points
- try to keep your speech organized it got a little disorganized at times
- good response to POTS
- good rebuilding

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sophia Nass

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3A6

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: NSMD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

BRIE Dukerine      Matt Mach

Score
82
100

Score
82
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS FJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Friesen      Alex Jackson

Score
84
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score

164
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

168
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

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

Drop needed to ~~explain~~ explain what particular problem this motion would address, or provide specific benefits that couldn't have been achieved without the motion.  
~~not clear on the~~

**Second Proposition**

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

Good clash with gov's case and ~~pointed out~~ good analysis of why the motion was unnecessary  
Could use more organization

**Second Opposition**

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Veena No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 302

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS-MD

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

Bre Dikshine

Matt Mochun

Score
82
100

Score
82
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS-FJ

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

Anya Frieden

Alex Jackson

Score
84
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score

164
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

168
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- ↳ Interesting deg in PM, BUT, main focus of core (Military preparedness) seemed strange
- ↳ 2 rebuttal, get to 'reply' part sooner
- ↳ Great fundamentals.

Second Proposition

- ↳ Got audience point, but engagement w/ Opp's claim (debatably) could have been better

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- ↳ Very stylistically good
- ↳ 2I's are very confident and serious, clearly very good though

Second Opposition

- ↳ Great content
- ↳ Stylistically, very true, draw attention to 1st part of
- ↳ Be confident! Take saying smart stuff.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. Valerianov

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 3A.7

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ONT - Y2

Team Name: MANITOBA - KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Ye

David Zhao

Peter Koczanski

Peirce Dickson

Score
82
100

Score
78
100

Score
83
100

Score
79
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

Well structured & nicely done!  
\* more specific examples.

Second Proposition

Use more specific examples

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- You used specific examples.  
- Well done!

Second Opposition

\* more specific examples, pls!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Carol St. Gelato

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3A7

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: ON - Y2

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Ye

David Zhang

Score
81
100

Score
77
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Peter Koczanski

Pei-ee Ahson

Score
83
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
161
200

~~PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION~~

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Nice model, good setup for case  
Good analysis on usefulness of military in disasters

Second Proposition

Good explanation of discipline as what we get from military service  
Better response was needed to opportunity cost point

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Very nuanced analysis, especially concerning how a militarized Canada leads to the outside world

Second Opposition

Good response, people can gain skills on own time.  
Better explanation of why military chase matters needed

RFD: Gov failed to iterate the full benefits of its plan until late in the debate and made claims as to why discipline was inherently good without explaining the mechanism. Opp proved that outward military gains of strength would harm Canada on the international stage. The benefits proved by Gov were well responded to when Opp pointed out that these skills could be gained by individuals on their own time.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Greg Frame

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3A7

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: On-YZ

Team Name: Manitoba - KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Morgan Ye

David Zhao

Peter Koczanski

Peira Dickenson

Score
81
100

Score
78
100

Score
83
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

759

200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

160

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Excellent structure
- Strong model
- Could have benefited from more concrete examples to reinforce points.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Well structured
- ~~was able to~~ provided clear examples, linked to analysis
- Was able to effectively dismantle the other teams main arguments.

Second Proposition

- Generally quite strong
- Structure a bit of an issue

Second Opposition

- Had a generally good structure
- Had internal ~~difficulties~~ in the constructive part of the speech.
  - i.e. Accessibility = less of respect = less effective military.
- This is a logical strain needs a clearer mechanism!



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Colleen McCutcheon

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 3F43

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec-DS

Team Name: Nova Scotia - JIM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie Denham

Harper Mettes

Ivy Journeay

Score
82
100

Score
<del>81</del>
100

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition** - very good final rebuttal, - you had the stronger points, might want stronger final rebuttal

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**  
 • Need to work on supporting your points, answering POs directly  
 • where was your rebuttal?  
 • I liked your speaking style - relaxed but not dull

**Second Proposition**

• you had harder points to argue but presented them well  
 • well constructed  
 • good rebutting

**Second Opposition**

• Filled your time well  
 • work on developing rebuttal, points  
 • caught holes in their definitions well

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. Litrovich

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3F43

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie Denham

Score
81
100

Score
81
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: New Scotia JM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Harper Metter

Ivy Journey

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score

162
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

149
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

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

- Perhaps overstating the risk of war?
- Maybe ability to effect change instead.
- Is patriotism always good?
- Good variation in tone
- Maybe don't walk around.
- I liked your POI, but please make it a question
- Great POI!

**Rebuttal:**  
- ~~could turn against country. Really?~~  
- Get to build down quicker

**Second Proposition**

- "It might sound irrelevant, but actually it is."
- Not the strongest presentation.
- Good answer to POI.
- Great role fulfillment

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

- Given prop's model, how likely is PTSD?
- Try to be more confident.
- Needs opportunity costs analysis

**Rebuttal:**  
- could turn against country? Really?

**Second Opposition**

- Honour point was weak
- St. Crispin's Day speech
- Weak POI answers
- Military doesn't have lasting effects on lifestyle?
- People can tell military men.
- Supposed contradiction in Prop case didn't exist

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Amanda Singh

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3F, 43

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: BCDS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Jamie Denham

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: NSJM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Harper Metler

Ivy Bourneay

Score
75
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

150
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Watch the defining of the motion. It was good but make sure that you specify country and years at the beginning, only said it later.

Second Proposition

Good role fulfillment.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

You could have read mapped and made your point and refutation clearly. your point could have more clearly been developed. Also be careful of redundant phrases and contradictions when you speak.

In your ~~own~~ final address a ~~good~~ down would have been more effective than a refutation much like your partners.

Second Opposition

Good pts. but rebuilding points too would have helped.

Good job everyone! Clearly all good speakers but the round overall could have used some meat.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katrine Doganoglu

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 3B.15

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba AS

Team Name: British Columbia SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Roshan Sadhak

Nicholas Aguiar

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Samantha Starkey

Holiden Beggs

Score
<del>72</del> 75
100

Score
77
100

Score
<del>78</del> 85
100

Score
<del>82</del> 84
100

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

Team Score

152
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

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

- try not to take so many POIs
- try to tighten up your structure + flow of your points → they seemed to blend into each other too much.
- try to focus on 2-3 points + analyze them well rather than having 4-5 points that you don't have time to effectively analyze.
- organize your summary speech into key themes or areas of clash.

**Second Proposition**

- good constructive material → it would also be better to ~~your own~~ decrease your number of arguments → ~~one~~ of your points were very similar to your partner's, and the other 2 (discipline + health) could probably have been ~~of~~ brought together as one argument about <sup>good balance of</sup> benefits to military training.
- good role fulfillment → ~~retort~~ <sup>good balance of</sup> rebuttal, rebuilding + constructive

RFD = Overall, prop's argumentation, analysis and structure was stronger than opp's.

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

*great POIs both of you.*

- excellent constructive material + analysis
- great POIs
- try to be more structured in your refutation so I can clearly hear that each point ~~has~~ been refuted
- good summary → the themes you chose were excellent, although again your organization could be better (i.e. signposting when you were moving between themes).

**Second Opposition**

- <sup>analysis</sup> great point about the fact that there is really no need for this → I think this should've come out in the first speech. Your second point was also quite strong + well analyzed.
- be careful not to cut yourself off for ~~POIs~~.
- also - make sure to clearly rebuild your partner's points → this ~~wasn't~~ <sup>wasn't</sup> ~~wasn't~~ <sup>wasn't</sup> ~~wasn't~~ <sup>wasn't</sup> really done.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Roger Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3B15

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AS

Team Name: BC-SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Roshan Sadhale      Nicholas Aguiar

Samantha Starkey      Holden Beppis

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>85</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>157</u> <del>103</del>
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<u>167</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: Coker

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3B15

PROPOSITION

Team Name: MANITOBA A5

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Roshan Sadhok

Nicholas Agwar

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC - SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Samantha Starkey

Holden Beggs

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score

200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

168
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- good constructive speech
- some points not distinct enough
- scaring people into peace is not the best formula
- spoke well and with vigor

Second Proposition

- spoke well.
- some good points.
- make sure you refute all of the other's side's points

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

spoke well  
Very strong constructive speech  
excellent points.

Second Opposition

spoke well.. <sup>good</sup> very constructive  
~~very constructive~~  
• very good PO/

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: HAMISH GUTHRIE

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: OLIVER'S

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BCDJ

Team Name: ABPK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SAFIR JAZAYERI

ALDLAK SINGHTHILLOL

NAVIN KAPOOR KARDIYAWASAM

NOAH PINNO

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>142</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<u>161</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Strong, vigorous manner.  
The definition might have been clearer, and this might have averted problems later in the case.

Second Proposition

Strong work in several ways. At times points might have been simpler, clearer.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Good main point in POI.  
Vigorous effective manner.  
Doubt cast on the gov. might have been stronger.

Second Opposition

This deck needs more attack, more recognition of problems in the gov. case; less constructive material.  
Plan would be more effective if shown

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Bowley Kay

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3B.2

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS DW

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elizabeth Duff

Marcus Wilmett

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zaid Salheen

Emil Stancu

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

150
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- model was not well chosen ...
  - made it difficult for there to be a good debate (set ~~as~~ South Korea, which already has rail lines)
- limited argumentation / lack of analysis

**Second Proposition**

- argument was very strange
- similar to the 1st argument made
- didn't add a lot to the rest, at confused Phys further

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- didn't address the problems with the model
- focused on an argument that was less important
- at least added some analysis/mention of wanting people who want to see to any

**Second Opposition**

- brought up an important point, needed more/better analysis
- was slightly more analytical than previous, but still lacking.



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Josh Cape

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3B.2

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia DW

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elizabeth Duff

Marcus Wilmoth

Zaid Salameen

Emil Stanca

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

151
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Be sure to have basic understanding of a country's policies if you choose to define it as the house - SK has mandatory military service
  - Be sure to be clear in your argumentation for judges, & always explicitly tie back arguments to resolution. SK is a threat... so?
  - In reply speech, use opp's themes & they have
- Second Proposition
- Bring a new perspective to the debate. SK has promise is merely an extension of 1st Prop
  - Organize your arguments
  - Be careful of controversy eg. rebels & militia

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Point out overt flaws in Prop's case first - sound but their mistakes carry the debate.
  - Good organization, but always tie your arguments back to case.
  - If an "argy" is better you need to prove it to them
  - Good use of themes in reply
- Second Opposition
- Morality is a good point but you need to prove why it brings protection in this case.
  - Don't just say - show.
  - Good point, prop hasn't proved case - be sure to really stress that.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CAROLINE WANNER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3B.2

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia DW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elizabeth Duff

Marcus Wilcott

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zaid Saleheen

Emil Stanca

Score
78
100

Score
77
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

- South Korea has mandatory military service.
- I don't expect you to know that but I expect that if you let a car in a random country it's because you have an idea
- lack of analysis - saying N. Korea is a threat is not enough
- Try not to bounce as much when you speak ;)

**Second Proposition**

- The whole twist about not actually being in the army didn't make sense to me
- ~~was~~ Good style

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- Point on the flaws in the case!  
You're not even using this army??
- weak constructive  
some good refutation

**Second Opposition**

- some good analysis that an actual military would be better
- Good style.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caitlin Danielson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3A.4

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario - TK

First Speaker:

Alexander Kamp  
~~Samira Koshwami~~

Second Speaker:

Romeo Tello

Score
74
100

Score
75 <del>TK</del>
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Alberta - GK

First Speaker:

Swish Koshwami

Second Speaker:

Ashish KC

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

149
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

150
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Good definitions but try to engage with your audience more!

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

very energetic, try to engage with the issues of the round rather than just giving counter examples.

Second Proposition

Good engagement try to flesh out your points a bit more.

Second Opposition

very engaging, make sure you clash with prop's substantive material rather than getting lost in model quibbles.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Denis Brault No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 3A4

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: OWT TK

Team Name: Alberta GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alexander Karp Romeo Tello

Swish Gosman Ashish KC

Score
72
100

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score
146
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Alexander  
While you present your points very clearly, try a little voice modulation for emphasis

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Swish  
Well structured speech

Second Proposition

Romeo  
Well structured speech. You addressed your opponent's points - good

Second Opposition

Ashish  
Compulsory military service less noble than chosen military service is a good point  
Good speaking style.

Both teams failed to engage seriously on the essential issues of the topic

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: TAYLOR STEELE

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3A.4

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO TK

Team Name: ALBERTA GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ALEXANDER KARP

ROMEO TELLO

SWISH GOSWAMI

ASHISH KC

Score
70
100

Score
72
100

Score
71
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score

142
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

144
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Need to prove the "why" of the motion. Odd age choice, in the model.  
Never clear we need a bigger military as Canada.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Clearer contentions, much more analysis.

Second Proposition

Link your examples, you can't just say "this works in Turkey / Kazakhstan" without explaining.

Second Opposition

Most compelling points, but superficially dealt with (PTSD and alternative (NfE goals).)

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caroline Mei

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 5

Room: 4A1A

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario 26

Team Name: Nova Scotia 'RF'

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Zheng

Raunak Gera

Rory Flynn

Mattia Roach

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

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

80  
79  
-----  
159

**Team Score**

159
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

**Team Score**

162
200

82  
80  
-----  
162

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

A good round! Both sides had good arguments. We wanted to hear more analysis on both sides though. On gov: what are "Canadian ideals?" and "how does this promote patriotism?" On opp: why do we value choice? We gave the round to opp. We felt opp gained the strategic advantage. In the round by claiming that choice and diversity were Canadian ideals - Opp's other main contention that you can be a contributive citizen who being in the military was also valid, and went unrefuted by gov.

**Second Proposition**

All speakers have great styles.

**Second Opposition**

More P.O.I.s would have been nice.

Good luck at the rest of the tournament and in future!



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marie Ouellet

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 5

Room: 4a1a

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario ZC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Zhing

Raenaelc Gera

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia RF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rory Flynn

Mattea Roach

Score
82
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

162
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- develop arguments further when discussing ideals elaborate on what those ideals are
- excellent presentation/confidence

Second Proposition

- develop arguments further elaborate on new examples ~~and~~ strengthen your argument.
- good rebuttals.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- noted contradictions in propositions arguments & assumptions ✓
- ~~responded appropriately to~~
- try to elaborate when using examples & go deeper when doing rebuttals.

Second Opposition

- arguments were similar to rebuttals & to first speakers arguments → develop more.
- very good answers to question

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mark Perlman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3A.9

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Azan Esmail

Samir Esmail

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Isaac Harris

Logan Stack

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
155
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Second Proposition

needs stronger analysis  
if why gov has  
right to force people  
to do something

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Opposition

~~pacific~~ pacifistic  
talk more about freedom  
of choice in PMR  
you too



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ahmad Nehmore

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 3A9

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta EE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Azan Gornail

Samir Gornail

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Isaac Harris

Logan Stack

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score
150
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

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

- You showed why it's a good thing but not why it's necessary nor why it is the only/appropriate way of bringing these advantages.
- Fill your time! (30 seconds left)
- What other countries do it successfully?

**Second Proposition**

- Again you gave advantages but not reasons.
- Taking 3 pps is too much.
- Fill your time too! (30 secs. left)

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

- Analyse the rights issue a bit more. Why in this particular case can't we limit rights and not just universally.
- Three points is a lot, stick to two.
- Because of the 3 points you didn't have time to refute.

**Second Opposition**

- OK points
- Refute point by point not just ideas here and there.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tracey Lee

No. of Judges: 3 Junior Round: 5 Room: 3A.9

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Albista EE

Team Name: Quebec HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Azan Esmail

Sanvir Esmail

Isaac Harris

Hogan Stack

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

155
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

Some good ideas but could have used a stronger model and perhaps more exploration about why countries that are not at war would still want to ↑ the military expertise of its citizens.

Second Proposition

For a motion like this, it would have been good to explain the need that exists in ~~this~~ society for this motion & then tell us how this change in policy addresses the need!

Really good understanding of the issues & how to defend your stance. Good job!  
- slow down a bit!

Second Opposition

Nice delivery, clear and well-structured rebuttal.