

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Allison Reader

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 3A4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Fresen

Alex Jackson

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario YZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Ye

David Zhao

Score
84
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score

147
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

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Comments given orally

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ABRAHAM MOURGEO No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: 3A14

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS-FJ

Team Name: ON-VZ

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

ANNA FRANKEN ALEX JAMISON

LOGAN LE DAVID ZHAO

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

Score
84
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score
147
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

Second Proposition

Second Opposition



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CAROLINE WAGNER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3A.4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anya Friesen

Alex Jackson

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~USA~~ Ontario YZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Logan Ye

David Zhao

Score
84
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score

149
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

167
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- sort of missed the point and ended up having to prove more than originally intended

Second Proposition

- Need more unique material

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Hit the ~~main~~ main points
- very good speaker

Second Opposition

- good speaker.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ahmad Nehme

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3A6

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kariyawasum

Noah Pinnco

Score
72
100

Score
71
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Oroff & O'Enno

Mariam Guindi

Score
72
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score
143
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
145
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- The round wasn't about disabilities it was about the effects of the war and drugs on the olympics.
- Fill your time!
- Good confidence!

Second Proposition

- we have Paralympics for people with disabilities :)
- the point was okay.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Good points / ideas
- Downer argumentation (2 mins isn't enough)

Second Opposition

- Hockey is an olympic sport :P
- Good ideas, analyze them more!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caroline Mei

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3A6

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

Team Name: Manitoba GO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kariyawasam Noan Pinno

Oreole Okunnu Mariam Guindi

Score
72
100

Score
72
100

Score
73
100

Score
75
100

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

72
+ 72

144

Team Score

144
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

148
200

73
+ 75

148

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

The round went to opposition.
We thought that the right arguments came out on opp
(unequal playing field / fairness, role models).
Gov didn't clarify what they meant by "drugs" (performance-
enhancing or medical?), and focused too much on the "disabilities"
idea.

gov+opp: It would be good if you both worked on analysis.
Answer "why" and "how" through your analysis..

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Good luck in future!



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katharine Cukier

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6 Room: 3A6

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta PK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Navin Kariyawansam

Noah Pro

Score
72
100

Score
72
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Orede Okunnu

Marinina Grundi

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score

144
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

147
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good speaker.
- model was set up weakly
- good structure but short.

Second Proposition

- good structure but needed to use all minutes

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- refuting all arguments
- good speaking skills
- den harsh "sit down"

Second Opposition

- refuted some arguments

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: T. Lee

No. of Judges: 3

Junior Round: 6

Room: 30.23

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Peirce Dickson Peter Koczanski

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia RF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rory Flynn Mattea Roach

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score

161
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Both speakers had some good arguments but at times somewhat contradictory. I would suggest that you choose a stance that your side is going to take and be consistent with argumentation.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Opp side was clearer and more consistent with their lines of argument as well as their refutation (good job on the refutation, Mattea)

Second Opposition

Areas to work on:
↳ make sure you finish your argument i.e. development was sometimes incomplete

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Bailey Kay

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3D-23

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Pierce Dickson

Peter Koczanski

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia RF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rory Flynn

Mattea Roach

Score
83
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

166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good ideas that were explained fairly well, but knowledge of the topic was lacking, so arguments weren't necessarily the most pertinent to the motion
- could also have gone a little deeper into some of the arguments

Second Proposition

- seemed like there was a bit of a disconnect in the line of argumentation
- also brought up a point that was a little weird, but he had better analysis than partner, and the arguments were better with the shift...

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- excellent speaker
- did a really good job of analysis / coming up with the right arguments

Second Opposition

- also a really good speaker
- had very good rebuttals to the prop points

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Cynthia Siino

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3D.23

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba KP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Pierce Dickson Peter Koczanski

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia RF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bony Flynn Mattea Roach

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score

162
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

there are inconsistencies
with the arguments

Second Proposition

Use more time for constructive

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Good refutation
try to expand constructive.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: TAYLOR STEELE

No. of Judges: 1

Round: Final Room: 4A, 1a

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Samantha Starkey

Holden Beggs

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QT TK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alexander Karp

Romeo Tello

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

Model (dealing testing to countries) is word and set of against the point of the motion. They could have made this a big deal.

Contradictions throughout case. If it's a huge black market, you cannot then say few athletes are on drugs.

Second Proposition

Generally cost arguments aren't the best.

Some incorrect logical steps.

Limited rebuttal.



Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Case could be far more interesting & varied, but you hit the needed things and had generally good rebuttal. Maybe different points within each speech, similar things came up in both because of an unclear definition.

Second Opposition

Somewhat disorganized, had some interesting constructive that could have been expanded on.

Don't cut off polys before the question is asked.

Everyone: Ask "why?" to all parts of rebuttal!!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Sophia Nass

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: SB13

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anmemeen Salim Layla Mawmin

Score
81
100

Score
84
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS MD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brie Dueshine Matt Machum

Score
85
100

Score
85
100

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

Team Score
165
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
170
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

very good refutation & interesting points regarding the purpose of the olympics & entertainment.

needed more analysis on how exactly this would lead to fairer games - if conceding certain people are too moral to take drugs

needed more analysis of why deterrents won't work, so we must give in
more discussion of benefits to the motion

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

point on good structure & good analysis the pressure athletes will now be under to take drugs (though this point could have used more analysis)

good analysis on the spirit of the games

could have used more analysis on why we outlaw things, even if it won't eliminate them completely.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mr. Liferovich

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: 5B16

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - EE

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Azer Esmail

Samir Esmail

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC - FD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kadie Freeman

Kian Araper

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

156
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

153
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Maybe not "good morning" anymore.
- Weak definition
- So steroids are still illegal?
- Got flustered during POI and took too long.

Rebuttal:

- Boil down was lacking
- Organization issues

Second Proposition

- It's not the morning...
- False contradiction - drugs are good and bad.
- ~~Needless hyperbole~~
- ~~Not focusing on key arguments~~
- POIs too long.
- Too much rhetoric

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Definition challenge
- Didn't address points specifically
- Use numbers
- Overstated first point
- Semantics not that important
- Overused "ladies and gentlemen"
- Decent POI about who gets to go.

Rebuttal:

~~Lack of boil down.~~
Second Opposition

- Good POI about changing use patterns
- Bad POI about "sorry rather than safe"
- Difficult to follow
- Needless hyperbole
- Not focusing on key arguments
- Why did you move out from podium?
- Felt random.
- Political rivalry doesn't matter. Boycotts?

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Amy Mya Kyaw

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: 4C1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DS

First Speaker:

Sam Skinner

Second Speaker:

Janie Derham

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Novascotia DW

First Speaker:

Marcus Willcott

Second Speaker:

Elizabeth Duff

Score
78
100

Score
78 80
100

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

Team Score

150
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good, clear model and definition
- I like your "band aid" solution point. You can expand it into saying, if we really want integrity, we won't pretend.
- Your first and second constructive points were sort of the same. "Cheatable" is a common premise in both.

Second Proposition

- "Cost" points not usually the strongest
- I like the "false positives" point
- Good point on "unity can still happen with drugs"

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Differentiate constructive and rebuttal. You mixed them.
- Breaks debate into themes or questions in summary speech.
- Good rebuttals.
- Don't leave good constructive to your partner, as a first speaker, you have to say all the strong constructive stuff

Second Opposition

- Very good rebuttals
- I like your constructive material about incentives and respect for the olympics
- Good structure and organization

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon Hoyt Hallett

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6 Room: 7C-5

PROPOSITION

Team Name: QC - HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Isaac Harris

Logan Stack

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC - CS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Foster Salpeter

Riley Cohen

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score
161
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
165
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good definitions - set the stage well for debate
- Strong use of POI's
↳ analysis of opp. case.
- Good rebuttal → slow down!

Second Proposition

- Great constructive speech
- Need to do more in depth
clashing → demonstrate
your analyzing skills.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Strong constructive arguments
- Cohesive arguments - good evidence
- Strong rebuttal - 2 questions.

Second Opposition

- Great clashing → your role!
- Slow down - very fast.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Veeru Gowami

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6 ⁰³²

Room: 3B2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK UC

First Speaker:

Corb Hagar

Second Speaker:

Hannah Costa

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON UK

First Speaker:

Alnur Isha

Second Speaker:

David Kern

Score
78
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

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- ↳ Unfortunately, this was not the correct way to win this case. Generally, this case is not as deep as good for the olympics.
- ↳ ~~at~~ attempt given not high

Second Proposition

- ↳ Well structured
- ↳ But must try to have

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- ↳ Refute more
- ↳ Great pt dealing w/ strange Gov. etc
- ↳ 2nd O/Ps argument should've been put first
- ↳ ~~Good~~ rebuttal spends correct times

Second Opposition

- ↳ ~~Smart~~ points
- ↳ Refute more!
- ↳ Good deepening & powerful analysis

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Amanda Siano

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3B.15

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SKHC

Team Name: ONLK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Caleb Haigh

Hannah Costa

Almur Kassim Lakha

Javia Kanm

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

Score
78
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

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good construction but the case wasn't defined ~~properly~~ properly.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good Boil down.
Constructive points could have been better.

Second Opposition

Overall, you are all good speakers just be careful of what you are saying, get the meat of your cases out in the first speeches.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Josh Gye

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 305.15

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Caleb Haight

Mannah Coste

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario LL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Almur Kassim LaKha

Javid Karim

Score
78
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

157
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Be sure to adopt a two-sided
debate - don't squabble it too
much. I commend creative interpreta-
tion, but not unfair analysis.
If you say we can trust (or must
trust) you need to prove it
too. Always support your allegations
& never say something opposition didn't
say

Second Proposition

Confidence.
Make sure you aren't isolated
by your partners arguments.
Bring something new to the
debate

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great ball down
You did the right thing in
contesting the definition
CONFIDENCE - get your hands
out of your pockets

Second Opposition

Great presence. Show down a
bit & be sure to organize
your address.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katrine Doganoglu

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: 3D-2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia JT

Team Name: Saskatchewan DM

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Tia Hutteman

Kevin Jacobs

Leora Diakou

Jillian McLeod

Score
71
100

Score
73
100

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score
144
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- you need to try to fill your time → your points really weren't analyzed - your constructive speech was just over 2 minutes total

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- you also need to try to fill your time. ^{- just over 4 min.}
- ~~you~~ you need to ~~be~~ clearly link your arguments to your side of the case → i.e. how ~~does~~ does having drug testing ~~help~~ help meet the purpose of the olympics?
- your summary was much stronger than your constructive.

Second Proposition

- your constructive point was good, but needed a bit more analysis
- you needed more refutation to 1st opp's points.

Second Opposition

- nice analysis in your ~~first~~ point.
- try not to get rattled by POIs.
- make sure to clearly refute all of prop's points - eg. cold medication point - ~~work~~

RFD: Overall, proposition lacked in terms of constructive material + analysis → win went to opposition because they brought more constructive matter + analysis to the round

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christina Orlando

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6 Room: _____

PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia, JH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tia Huttmann Kevin Jacobs

Score
70
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan, DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Lara Diakow Jillian McLeod

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score

143
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- be sure to fill your time
- good clear speaker
- be sure to analyze your points more.
- Ask yourself "why?" to help you analyze.

Good questions in your final speech.

Second Proposition

- Good POI
- Be sure to respond directly to POI's
- Try to stay away from personal examples
- Good clear speaker.
- Try to fill your time by asking yourself "why?"
- to be more realistic in your statements.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- good response to POI
- be careful not to contradict yourself.
- try to fill your time by asking yourself, "why?" after each point.

Second Opposition

- Good response to POI
- Be confident in what you are saying.
- good well-developed points
- you brought up many of the important points.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Roger Smith No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: 3D2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC JH

First Speaker:

Tia Hutterman

Second Speaker:

Kevin Jacobs

Score
<u>71</u>
100

Score
<u>73</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask DM

First Speaker:

Leora Diabow

Second Speaker:

Sillian Meled

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>144</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>152</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: HAMISH GUTHRIE

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: OLIVER'S

PROPOSITION

Team Name: QCKZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

MARIA ZIMMERMANN ATHINA KHALID

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QCGG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

JULIAN GUIDOTE ADRIEN GOIN

Score
77
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

155
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Not an easy bill to defend!
Take analysis further. Consider
more reasons why no tests.

Avoid contradictions! (Is it a good
idea to permit use of drugs if parents
will tell children that this drug
we can be very harmful.

Second Proposition

Take POIs when you are ready -
not too early.

Deeper your analysis. Get
your best arguments out
earlier. The point about how
hard it is to test reliably
should come out earlier.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Some good skills. Deeper analysis.
Give me even stronger reasons why
This bill is not a good idea.

Some good ideas. Make delivery
smoother, more concise, more
vigorous.

Second Opposition

Some v. good arguments - such as
the v. serious harms of these
drugs - but this point, for
example, should have come out
earlier.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Card St. Gelais

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 6

Room: 3F43

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SS

Team Name: Alberta GK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emil Stancea

Zaid Sakhn

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Swish Goswami

Ashish KC

Score
74
100

Score
74 73
100

Score
78
100

Score
75
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

A different way to run this case since it requires proving drug tests are not deterrents. Consider just letting people use drugs publicly.
Good organization and flow.

Second Proposition

Nice constructive point, greater need for refutation.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

A good speech, you refuted well and identified flaws in the case as well as presenting a good justification for drug tests to promote integrity within sport.

Second Opposition

Could have used more developed refutation. Also some new material. Speaker did a good job of keeping his partner's points relevant.

RFD. Opp adequately demonstrated drug tests could deter drug use by athletes and why this was important.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marie Ouellet

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 6

Room: 3f43

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SS.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emil Stanca Zaid Salameen

Score
72
100

Score
70
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta GK.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Swish Goswami Ashish KC

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
142
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- for the argument to stand needed more development
 → based on some assumptions.
- strong presentations skills. confidence.

Second Proposition

- arguments were very similar to first speakers
- strong refutation — just try and go a little deeper

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Arguments were relevant + needed a little more elaboration — liked the use of examples!
- strong refutations
 some could have been more developed + really targeted the flaws in the propositions arguments.

Second Opposition

- good recentralization of the debate — really returned it to the basic issues being debated.
- 2nd argument wasn't as strong

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. Valerianos

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3B-2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sask - OH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Slade Hall

Dominic Ong

Score
76
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Fm - Alberta

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
75
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

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

*privacy + right? → individual freedom.

- shift in model

Second Proposition

Use examples.
Too much rhetoric.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

*cheating to allow drug testing?

↓
Doesn't fit into model.

Second Opposition

~~... ..~~
mention accessibility to drugs - is this fair?
↳ poor vs. rich
↳ would this create unity?
(No)

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Gregory Famer

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: 3B.2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan OH

Team Name: FM-Alberta

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Slade Hall

Dominic Ong

Bryan Ma

Jeremy Fan

Score
76
100

Score
74
100

Score
75
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

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- ~~That~~ Shift was hugely difficult
Case to accept
- structural problems

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Failed to Address any privacy rights arguments/points
- Missed difference between beneficial v. harmful drugs.

Second Proposition

- poor structure
- Didn't have an argument nearly talked about world peace.

Second Opposition

- Brought in substantive analysis
- well organized.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Brian Casey

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3B-2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK-OH

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta FM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SLAOG HALL

DOMINIL ANG

BOYON MA

JEREMY FAN

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>154</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>156</u>
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

inclined to read too

much.

[Your poi about negative
was rebutted by you can

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

POI's were too long
and too frequent.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lisen Bassett

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3A7

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC DJ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Safir Jazayer

Amdak Singh Dhillan

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO ZG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Zheng

Raunak Gera

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

152
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

◦ Great speaker! Try to keep going w/ the points you introduce.

Second Proposition

Good responses to POIs & good speaking speed!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good outline ~~ob~~ with respect to your speech (we had a good idea of when you were refuting vs. constructing vs. reconstructing) and you actually followed through with it, which was nice. However watch your speed, you were saying good stuff I just couldn't always follow you.
◦ Take a POI!

Second Opposition

Very clear speaking & organizational style. Your arguments were also very good just the only thing to watch out for would be using personal pronouns to refer to your opponents. It can sometimes feel too aggressive/condescending when you say "you"

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Denis Brault

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3A-7

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC DS

Team Name: Ontario 2G

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Safir Jazayeri Amandak Singh Dhillon

Catherine Zhou Ronda K Gera

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

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

Team Score
156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
160
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Consistent speech and rebuttal
Interesting take but model wasn't substantiated

Second Proposition

More reconstruction was necessary

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good reputation of Poi. You spoke a little too quickly (always at same fast pace) and thus lose effectiveness in emphasizing points

Second Opposition

Very strong speaking style

You are all good debaters!

The name is Lance Armstrong - not Neil Armstrong and I think he did it without steroids.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Caitlin Danielson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3A-7

PROPOSITION

Team Name: B-C-D-J

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Safir Jazayer Amolak ^{Singh} Phillon

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario 26

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Catherine Zheng Raunak Gera

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
159
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

you are clearly a very good speaker, but you need to engage with the resoluton rather than modeling around it.

Second Proposition

confident delivery, try to attack their ~~conventions~~ ^{constructive} ~~points~~ ^{issues} more than just

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

you have so many good things to say, PLEASE slow down.

Second Opposition

Great delivery but ~~you~~ take more time ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~your~~ ^{your} ~~points~~ ^{substantive} to outline your constructive.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Keenan MacNeal

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3A9

PROPOSITION

Team Name: QC-DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valentini

Nikolas de Stefano

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MB-AS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nicholas Aguiar

Roshan Sadhale

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

152
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Debate the intent, not the wording

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

More directed clash

Second Proposition

Lay out the harms of the status quo more clearly

Second Opposition

Work on maintaining tone

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mark Perlman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3A.9

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valentini

Nikolas De Stefano

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nicholas Aguiar

Roshan Sadhak

Score
80
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

162
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Personal

Second Proposition

Privacy

"they get tested elsewhere"

contradicts trust as basis for conduct

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good PMR

"drugs are bad" is not a contention

Second Opposition

Good response to POI's

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Colleen McEutcheon

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 3A9

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec DV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karl Valentini

Nikolas De Stefano

Score
78
100

Score
77.5
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba AS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nicholas Aguiar

Roshan Sachak

Score
79
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

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition • didn't pick strongest points
how could have
• good speaking style

Second Proposition - work on how to wrap up
your speech
• try not to write out speeches
• good handling P.O.I.s

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition
• seemed nervous
• spend less time on rebuttal, more on
constructive
• asked some good P.O.I.s

Second Opposition

• good speaking style - work on tone (a little
loud)
• handled P.O.I.s fine
• managed to touch on most of debate

EVERYONE - careful with contradictions!