

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Theo McLaughlin

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1 ^{Senior}

Room: French 3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nick Martin

Thomas Lanothe

Score
85
100

Score
82 ^{T.M.} 83
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan ZK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelly Zheng

Rainer Kasis

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
168
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Very well-organized and well-presented; gov overall was a little shifty on the environment and could have used more early on in the PM about this. Decent rebuttal speech but I didn't think the nature of claims was so key; I could have used ~~more~~ more driving home of the unilateral/multilateral point.

Second Proposition

A solid speech that effectively clashed with opp on the best way to achieve environmental protection. Had a little bit of paternalism towards indigenous peoples; that point could have used more nuance. Your POI to the 2nd Opp speaker was very effective.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

~~That~~ You hit back well at the gov. on the possibility of sustainable exploitation. However, for all that you suggested multilateralism as an alternative, it would have been nice to see a bit more of what that would look like. Ultimately I found the approach to the clash of the debate a little too assertion-based.

Second Opposition

An interesting response. You took a brave line to say that Canada couldn't be trusted either. This could have really been the key to the debate but it needed a little more thorough treatment from you both. I thought focusing on a "contradiction" was too much; there was slipperiness but not to that level.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Catherine Holloway

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: French 3

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba ML

Team Name: Saskatchewan ZK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nic Martin

Thomas Lamothe

Kelly Zheng

Rainer Kocsis

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

168
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Strong delivery
clearly established points
strong introductions and conclusions
Contention that the Arctic is changing was well made

Second Proposition

Some unfortunate phrasing detracted from an exceptionally well organized speech
Solid refutation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Addressed problems of exploitation very well, but less clear on how multilateral approach would actually work
S/R speech boiled debate down to excellent questions

Second Opposition

military build up ~~point~~ was less successful
but St-Lawrence seaway was a good counterpoint - more detail about it would have been helpful

Very strong round!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kate Rochford

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: French 3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nic Martin

Thomas Lamothe

Score
<u>86</u>
100

Score
<u>85</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan ZK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelly Zheng

Rainer Koosis

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>171</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>160</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- wasted a lot of time @ beginning
↳ not enough time on constructive
HOWEVER, great points, well researched
- 2nd speech needed analysis of 2nd opp points
- good sum up

Second Proposition

- a lot of internal refutation
- needs more constructive time
- good POI responses

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- good refutation
- needed more depth to caseline
↳ focused strongly on environment ONLY
- watch your time! Each point needs strong analysis
- good sum up. You know what you are saying, have confidence

Second Opposition

- Road map could have been clearer
- good analysis of ~~the~~ model issue
↳ but too late in the round
- points needed more analysis
- time management!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Cameron

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Geo

PROPOSITION

Team Name: PT- Manitoba

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Pistorius

Adrienne Tessier

Score
85
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NWT- John Franklin

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Greg Hanna

Emily Smith

Score
83
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
163
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- + strong speaking skills:
very clear use of varied tone and tempo.
- several logical flaws in his core arguments: eg. he does not reconcile resource extraction with environmental protection.

Second Proposition

- many arguments made on the basis of ~~patriotism~~ or concern for future generations but no demonstration of concern with the long-term implications of non-renewable resource extraction.
- Too much reliance on patriotism for its own sake.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- + strong debater: well organized, clearly and passionately delivered arguments.
- ~~some arguments had~~
- + quick to recognize and refute flaws in Prop's arguments

Second Opposition

- too much time spent on personal appeals about local communities and not enough time on the major, overarching issues.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MARK LAZAR

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Geography

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: PT - MAW

Team Name: NWT - Sir John Frank

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Pistorius Adrienne Tossier

Greg Hanna Emily Smith

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>80</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>163</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Sets out Proposition points well
Good speaking style and
contact w Audience.

" never responded to opp contention
that recent huge investments
are enough - "

Good style :

Second Proposition

Rebuts First Opposition well
Presents some good new points
Responds well to PO 1 and
makes some good points

Nice debate style responses.

Dwelled to much on economic
presence - what about research,
shelf + satellite, etc - didn't

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Obliviance - good word -
Great debate style and
confidence

Watch phrase
"sure it would be great to do it
but ... " lucky they did not grab
this

Great rebut

each side left too many open opps -
to secure solid win

Second Opposition

Anti- "colonization"
Interesting rebuttal as I was waiting
to hear you get personal
on this topic - good.

At 1 min - seemed to run out
of information -

Good speaking style +
presence.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Robinson

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: F1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland RS

Team Name: BG

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Rees

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julia Milden
~~Zack Gaytella~~

Zack Gaytella

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Score
80
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

- Good clear case
- perhaps should have more evidence sources to back up claims in case opp disagrees
- Good delivery
- Well organized

Second Proposition

- Good response to their attacks. They would be even better if they were backed up more, e.g. are there a lot of resources.
- V. Good delivery
- > Good summary of partner's points
 - > Should have refuted more of their constructive case more directly

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- > good attacks. They would have been even better with more analysis e.g. why would natives gain
- > V. good delivery
- > Very good reply/rebuttal speech.
- > your case spent too much time on military and other competition but that is not what they were suggesting.
- > Good POIS

Second Opposition

- Good summary of their case
- Good attacks
- > Good arguments about dangers.
- > V. Good delivery
- > at times, could be more forceful

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Amanda Siino

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: F1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NFRS

Team Name: BCMS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan Daniel Ross

Julia Milden Zack Santella

Score
79
100

Score
77
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

Clear points and well developed.
PMR could have been more effective in tying in all the points and examples

Second Proposition

Be careful to directly address the POIS, don't dance around them and if you only get to it later, make it clear.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great POIS.
~~Point~~ First point wasn't all that relevant, ~~because~~ maybe the 2nd speaker's points should have come first because it was more of the meat

Second Opposition

well developed point & good ref. more POIS.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tristano Tenaglia

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: F1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland BS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Pees

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia M.S

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julia Milder

Zack Santella

Score
81
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

160
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Very well researched clearly but in order to counter, you should discuss opp. topics directly in order to clearly establish a direct debate against the other team.

Second Proposition

Focused to much on specific and same topics. Shouldn't always repeat previous points in order to counter. Make sure to bring up new points in a fresh manner.
Very good intonation and easy to understand!!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Fantastic POI's and you were clearly able to counter topics well, however your personal points should be elaborated and made more clear.

Second Opposition

Should not have waited so long to take the POI's but the points you brought up were very specific and well established, but should have been brought up in first opposition.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katarina Daniels

No. of Judges: 2
B.

Round: 1

Room: North Comp. Lab.

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta HL

Team Name: BC-RT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Zephi Kramer

Ben Turner

Score
83
100

Score
79 79
100

Score
79
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
161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good presence.
- random intro?
- no concrete information

Second Proposition

- needs work on presentation
- was on topic.

TEAM: arguments need to be more obvious. Didn't match outline.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- NO ACTUAL ARGUMENTS.
- all refutation.
- strong speaker, good tone, passionate.
- focus on environment, but what? status quo? is that enough? didn't go anywhere.
- strong summarizing skills

Second Opposition

- strong speaker
- tried to bring in the groups arguments but didn't get there.
- better research.
- strong organization

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marianne Amar

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: North Camp

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee Michael Haskins

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC - RT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zephi Kramer Ben Turner

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>82</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>161</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

need to go further
in argument
good last speech

Second Proposition

need to go further in
argument

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

need own argument
good speaker

Second Opposition

good speaker
good argument

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: W. BASLYK

No. of Judges: 3

Round:

Room: M3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: B.C (EL)

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amina Egeh

Terry Lee

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NFLD. (WN)

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Morgan Walsh

Kate McNeil

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
155
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Excellent opening speech style wise
- Problems to be confronted well laid out with solutions
- A few too general pts. in rebuttal

Second Proposition

- Average presentation but logic not always consistent
- Some errors in presentation

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Answered prop's statement effectively
- Good rebuttal and summary of key points

Second Opposition

Solid presentation
Good analysis of costs esp socio-economics

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BARRY LAZAR

No. of Judges: 3

Round: _____ Room: 1.3

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: B.C. - EL

Team Name: UN NFLD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

AMINA ESCH

TERRY LEE

MORGAN WALSH

KATE MCNEIL

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score	154
	200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score	155
	200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

V good knowledge
 Impassioned delivery - stronger after 1st PAGE
 Key points - Education, RATIONALE
 Good rebound to POI from MORGAN
 Repetition of key points - structure confusing
 could use PAUSES, INFLECTIONS.

V good presence, projection
 V good SUMMARY of key points

Second Proposition

STRONG, COMFORTABLE delivery
 Good MASTER of facts
 POI - MORGAN - good refutation

Overall STRONG Presentation
 But did NOT support ARGUMENTS

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

3 POINTS - DIPL., ENV. COSTS
 POI from ~~AMINA~~ TERRY on Poverty
 POI from AMINA - on ASSIMILATION
 WIC But not great recovery
 POI - refuted - good
 Repetition of point re environment
 POI - speculation - V. Nervous towards End
 STRONG rebuttal, good audience contact, V. present
 - 3 POINTS, - repetitive re 2 topics.

Second Opposition

FXGO Behind lectern, poor balance - X'd legs.
 POI - Terry Lee - good
 POI - Lee - poor refutation - on sovereignty
 COSTS -
 POI - AMINA - good refutation, strong facts
 Good SUMMARY

Overall - weaker presentation
 But Better logic + ARGUMENTS

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. Literovich

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M-3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC-EL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amina Egoh

Terry Lee

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NFLD-WN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Morgan Walsh

Kate McNeil

Score
78
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

157

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Very heavy on facts
- Light on analysis
- Some facts were unnecessary
- Second half of plan lacks specifics

Rebuttal:
 - What's the third thing you had to show?!

- Points for calling them "Inuit"

Second Proposition

- US/Canada can do bilateral agreements - no UNCTAD necessary
- "our dependence on foreign oil" ??? -> Tar-sands?
- weak analysis of oil prices. "oil in Middle East" ???
- nuclear power is currently available
- how does diversifying locations help with boom and bust?

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Please call them the Inuit.
- Explain how we're upsetting the agreements. (with US)
- Hyperbolic -> "impractical... ridiculous... preposterous..."
- Oil spills point. Requires sovereignty?

Rebuttal

- Isn't aggression worth it at times
- Healed through neglect and assimilation.

Second Opposition

- Great point on the Beaufort.
- Free market argument was decent.
- Frequent use of "moreover"
- Stop calling them "natives."

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Debra miko

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: Physics LAB

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SASK. SM

Team Name: Manitoba SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

NASRA Moumin Areeb Salim

Kristen Solmurdson Helen Beaumont

Score
79
100

Score
82
100

Score
80
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

159
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Well prepared speech.
Good opening .. Had 3 really good contentions but didn't develop all to their potential. A lot of repetition. Ideally you need to be clear on your expected outcome and focus there to be followed.

Second Proposition

PAUSE FOR EFFECT

Well Done! You kept command well.
Develop what was missed
Overall the best speaker in the room

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good clash + Good contentions
Better than the good Canadians...

What about other resources being disturbed.
If it ain't broke don't fix it.

Second Opposition

→ Get involved earlier with the round
Great Speech ... loved your passion.

Canadian National Debating Championships

26.4.12
13:00-14:00

Judge's Name: WEIGEL, Melvin

No. of Judges: 3

Round: Room: red

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK-TR

First Speaker:

Sdraiz Tariq

Second Speaker:

Abdul Rahman

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-KD

First Speaker:

Jamal

Second Speaker:

Armaan

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>80</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>163</u>
	200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

some times hard to understand -

Second Proposition

*global warming supply/demand argument about a more product not strong, also was not clearly expressed until the very end.
"countries like Norwegian"*

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

*- spoke clearly
- coherently
- in control of ideas*

Second Opposition

*opposition raised point about proposition leading to more resource exploitation. proposition ended up admitting it with weak counter argument that "everyone's doing it"
- opposition started with position apparently weaker & did well with it.*

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julie Horton

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1 (SR)

Room: Red Room

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SA SKATCHEWAN TR

Team Name: BC KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Gulraiz Tariq

Abdul Rehman

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jamal Dumas

Armaan Kossan

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

Score
83
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
163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

While overview intro of arguments was a little jumbled, arguments were well-expressed, researched good command of facts

Addressed POI well, integrated to own considerations
Good summary

(slow down a bit
summary/rebuttal - lots of ideas & passions in evidence.

Second Proposition

Addressed arguments of opp quite well though lacked some precision in marshalling his facts, ideas

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

good POI - both timing & context & addressed POI raised well.

Rebuttal comments were well-expressed with strong ideas.

Expressive confident speaker
Very good summary

Summary/rebuttal → strong address on pro arguments so prove 2 points (status quo sufficient, harm), Met crux well.

Second Opposition

Addressed POI's well, tying into important aspects of opp's arguments.

Introduced interesting new arguments & had good facts, ideas to support.

Articulate presenter

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Chihab El K

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1 (Sr) Room: Red Room

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan TR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Gulraiz Tariq

Abdul-Rehman

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jamaal Dumas

Armaan Kassam

Score
83
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
163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good structure
Doesn't need to define model as literally
Explain more why an increased presence would bring a significant change to status quo

Second Proposition

- ⊗ Good refutation
- ⊕ Perhaps be clearer about when you begin refutation and when you begin constructive
- ⊕ Not enough analysis in the new constructive

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- ⊗ Good speech!
- ⊕ Good structure, brought most relevant points to the round.
- ⊗ Perhaps think about bringing the stewardship point in the first speech
- ⊗ Good burden weights. ⊕ Not enough time for best point

Second Opposition

- ⊗ Good points, good refutation
- ⊗ Perhaps be clearer about when you begin your constructive material
- ⊕ Not enough time on the business point

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Deirdre Casey

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1 ^{OF HS (3)} Room: English 3

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec KM

Team Name: Manitoba HW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Michelin Emma Katz

Michael Honke Anthony Wright

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

Score
80
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
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Make sure to link back all arguments ~~link~~^{to} plan and case stance (ie how population particularly is solution)
→ Reply had good material but more point-by-point rebuttal than thematic summary

Second Proposition

The idea of teaming up with US seems to be a shift in your case — remain as consistent as possible with your partner.
→ Good handling of ^{rough} POIs.

RFD: Ultimately, gov. failed to link their population ~~benefits~~^{plan} to the benefits they asserted, and OPP called them out on their case shift. Additionally opp had a more realistic world view.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good arguments and constructive analysis
Reply should try to look more at where arguments clashed in the round (focused more on own material)

Second Opposition-

Careful about calling judges people the "dregs of society"
SLOW DOWN please!!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: EDWARD BECHARD

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: Math-1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SASK FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aaron Entzler

Arthur Hamilton

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario KK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tae-Hu Kim

Anson Kwok

Score
85
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score

155
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

167
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

comments given orally.

Reason for decision: in the end, some faith in international law & method of establishing Canadian presence asked that was dramatic. OPP also advanced a number of if GOVT had won the debate

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

opp had persuaded me that putting organizations was the most likely successful sovereignty, and that an increase in military risked compromising Canada's UN/legal claim. enviro+social harms that may have been compelling concerning which method best secured arctic sov.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

(PM)

Judge's Name: Justin Kuznetsov

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Main 2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba

Team Name: British Columbia

First Speaker: Ariel Melamedoff Second Speaker: J. Gerstein

First Speaker: Maddie Armstrong Second Speaker: Sonam Rai

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score
<u>161</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle)

Team Score
<u>163</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

great speakers
more examples

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

great speakers
well done.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M.K. Jackson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Math-2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Mb-GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ariel Melamedoff JJ Gvstein

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Maddie Armstrong Sonam Bai

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>84</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>165</u>
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: PETER SZILAGYI

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MATH-2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MB-GM

Team Name: BC-AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ARIEL MALAMEDOFF J.S. GERSTEIN

MADDIE ARMSTRONG Soham Rai

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>83</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>164</u>
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Emanuel Simon

No. of Judges: 3

Round:

Room: English 1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aislin Flynn

Clarissa Brisseau

Score
<u>85</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christoph Pike

Leo Phwer

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>167</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
159
200

159

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- very poised speaker
- well-organized
- well-constructed arguments
- great rebuttal at the end

Second Proposition

- very good examples
- great handling of opponents' points
- could ~~use~~ enunciate more clearly and slow down a bit.
- could use better time management

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- could have used better examples
- well-organized
- good speaker
- good summation of points
- ~~could~~ could use better time management

Second Opposition

- Had very good points
- Read too much
- Dealt with questions well

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jordan Gentle

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: English 1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FB

First Speaker:

Aislin Flynn

Second Speaker:

Clarissa Brossan

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

First Speaker:

Christopher Pike

Second Speaker:

Leo Plummer

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score
164
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good use of pois
- Good open statement, led well into the rest of your speech
- Well outlined points and good roadmaps
- Economic present stronger point than the utility point
- 3 themes were clear and well argued in the rebuttal speech ~~the~~

Second Proposition - Try offer a couple more POIs

- Good job in simplifying a scientific argument which can usually be very complicated and dry
- The scientific research argument countered the environmental argument very well
- Try rebuilding your partner's points w/ the last min. 1:30 min. It will help re-strengthen your case

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good use of POIs
- Good roadmaps
- Dirty Diplomacy point was not clearly fleshed out
- Got to the essence of the environmental argument, not just examples
- Good rebuttal of prop 1's points
- 3 themes were well picked as key issues for the round

Second Opposition

- Offer more POIs
- Try use less examples and get to the main reasons of the argument
- Your point had some good ideas but you would benefit from clarifying them
- Importance of workers is a great point, that could have been developed into a full argument

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: AMIR KHOUJAM

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1 Room: EW-1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nove Scotia FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aislin Flynn

Clarissa Brisseau

Score
80 84
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christoph Pitke

Leo Plumer

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
166
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good organization and structure
- slow down slightly
- good response to POI's, and good POI's given.
- Good final speech, try and maintain serenity and persuasiveness throughout the speech.

Second Proposition

Very good knowledge - use specifics! Green technology? like what?
- Great rebuttal
- Leave time to rebuild, and shorten time spent on point, a little bit too long, repetitive.
Very good speech.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good speech
- Good presentation & organization
- be more explicit in rebuttal speech, as to what both Opp & prop have to prove in the debate.

Second Opposition

- Give more POI's
- good address of social issues and pointing out the Prop. mistake in not address it.
- Give more time to rebuttal & rebuild.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CAROLINE WAGNER

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: CHEM LAB

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS OB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Debi Ogunrinde

Oliver Björnsson

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Stephen Cho

Alif Karmali

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score

163
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Really nice in no for as to why this is important & how it would be done
- You're a very convincing speaker

Second Proposition

- spend a bit less time refuting
- interesting about law control (ie fishing & drilling) I would have liked to hear more

ultimately opp failed to attack several major gov points.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Good ideas
- very good speaker
- i feel that the constructive was not substantiated enough... "we don't have the money" type arguments tend to not be as strong

Second Opposition

- A bit contradictory stance of making profit off what we have but not ~~from~~ from if we got more
- Also a very good speaker.

Canadian National Debating Championships

SR5

Judge's Name: Caroline Mei

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: B10 LAB.

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan WX

Team Name: Alberta SV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

Zack Shapiro

Christopher Virtue

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

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

$\begin{matrix} 79 \\ + 2 \\ \hline 158 \end{matrix}$

Team Score
158
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
151
200

$\begin{matrix} 75 \\ + 76 \\ \hline 151 \end{matrix}$

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Overall, a good round. It was clear that both teams had done extensive and thorough research on the resolution.
The round went to proposition, who I thought was able to provide a clear solution to the problems that Canada currently has in the Arctic.
I think, on opposition, that the question is not "does Canada have claim to the Arctic?". I think that you have to ask "why does military presence exacerbate the problems in the status quo and/or create new problems?".

Second Proposition

Good job. and best of luck in future.
😊

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

The question is not "does Canada have claim to the Arctic?". I think that you have to ask "why does military presence exacerbate the problems in the status quo and/or create new problems?".

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Elizabeth Winans

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: M4

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario - SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tarang Maratha

Alastair Smith

Score
81
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec - BR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sarah Battat

Sabrina Ray

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

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

Team Score

160
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Tarang :
• well organized
• well layed-out
• very good summary

RFD

on the topics of the potential economic benefits and environmental harms (two fairly major points of clash), I'd say that ~~of~~ Gov. minorly won, but the more important, broader themes of ① will it ~~asset~~ ^{worth} ② is ~~that~~ the risk to equality of life, ~~and~~ ~~the~~ opposition gave more nuanced analysis and better refutation.

Second Proposition

Alastair

- more P.O.I.s
- could be more organized
- great content

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Sarah : good P.O.I.s
↳ could have clarified overall team-wide organization better
excellent summary speech

Second Opposition

Sabrina : great knowledge of the subject
• well-organized

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nicolas Méthot

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Will Dawson

Rebecca Sutton

Score
75
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Shervin Yusef-Zadeh

Yesha Ouyang

Score
78
100

Score
76
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

- Strong intro.
- Weak content, low burden
- Good speaking skill.
- Needed to go in depth more, have more points, etc.
- Some factual errors/assertions.

Second Proposition

- Good speaking, well researched.
- Very ~~one~~ single-faceted points, needed more content.
- No POIs.
- Some case tension.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Good speech, called Gov on errors.
- Good rebuttal.
- Could have dealt with more points, diversify and analyze more.
- Made a few assertions.
- Good use/taking of POIs.

Second Opposition

- Good speaker, same as above.
- a little less well done than shervin.
- more new content, development would have been nice.
- Good POIs.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christian Jugas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: N-S OS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Will Dawson

Rebecca Sutton

Score
78
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: B-C ay

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Shorvin Y-Zadeh

Yesha Dugery

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score

151

200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

153

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Good confidence and gestural

Second Proposition

Some lack of development

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Clear stance gov vs opposition

Second Opposition

Points out inconsistencies of gov

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: VINAY DESAI

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS 3

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA - DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Will Dawson

Rebecca Sutton

Score
82 82
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BRITISH COLUMBIA - OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Shervin Yusef-Zadeh

Yesha Ouyang

Score
83 83
100

Score
81 81
100

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

Team Score
162
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Spoke very well
- First argument was not the strongest, relate it to the "significant" part
- good POI's
- strong summary

Second Proposition

- Organize points a little better to make them have more of an impact
- good rebuttal / clash

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Spoke well, good rebuttal
- Maybe have 2 points instead of just one
- Good job of bringing up your partner's POI & taking a stance early on

Second Opposition

- Generally better to have rebuttal towards the end of the speech and start with constructive arguments
- Leave summary to 1st OPP & try and rebuild your partner's points

ROUND: Good clash, but some points were lacking material
But speakers were very good.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Celina

No. of Judges: 3

Round: #10

Room: Speers Seminar

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO NM

Team Name: NSDM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaitlyn Meloche

Norman Nemm

Allyson Duff

Blair MacNeil

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

Score
81
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 159
200

good.
8:15

so cannot deny judge

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: definition
First Proposition: not necessary
presence

Judge's Comments: not best in 2nd prop speech!
First Opposition: fighting for status quo
and why is this problematic?
not clear.

① Need for scientific
↳ do satisfy data to U.N. environmental changes. (ecosystem) improving
↳ extreme technological advances. (ecosystem) improving
② economic benefits
↳ Northwest trade route (between Canada & Denmark)
↳ international sea passage is important for international commerce (good)
↳ tourism (not convinced)
③ Foreign oil (obvious pt.) → NAFTA trading agreements

① Arctic sovereignty
↳ Northern
↳ focus on what you have
↳ should be international waters should remain as such.
↳ Canada itself should stand for what we already have is enough for us to handle.
② Status quo = bad
↳ contradiction & status quo = bad
↳ reputation

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Excellent Roadmapping
↳ do not agree with reconstruction 1st
→ scientific pt is pretty useless to debate considering the fact that scientific presence has already been important
↳ I fail to see why you think it's so important
↳ should map borders... ok?
↳ part of Canada
↳ to exist → such a bad pt
↳ don't keep on it.
8:12
this is already a reputation
this is already a reputation
this is already a reputation

① Negative domestic impact 8:28
↳ we have a strong claim
↳ priorities of Canadians.
↳ through Inuit groups
↳ international law recognizes this which is true.
↳ you keep bringing up Nunavut
↳ I fail to see the link or why you think it's important
↳ you think it's important
↳ you think it's important
↳ you think it's important

① Aspect of security
↳ no notice of ships
↳ economic incentive can lead to security issues

Reputations
↳ which is not the issue!
↳ Russian pt → this is not Russian support
↳ you think it's important
↳ you think it's important
↳ you think it's important

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: DAVID PRICE

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Speirs Seminar

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ont NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaitlyn Meloche Norman Nehmeballah

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff Blair MacNeil

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

162
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Vary tone & gestures to emphasize points

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Watch the reading/eye contact (esp. early in speech)

Watch clarity of certain points (e.g. precise extent of Russia's claim)

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon Mechanic

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: Spears Seminar

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Assumption

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaitlyn Melocke Norman Velmetlah

Score
77
100

Score
83
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~NS~~ Nova Scotia - DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff

Blair MacNeil

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: 6) answer - is there a distinction blwn Alaska cruises & Baffin Island - should do it, prove it to me

1) Tone/delivery - hand motions & tone them down; delivery - slow down, I need to process your logic. BUT... overall, very clear delivery

2) Generally, I would rather see 3 points, expanded in greater detail.

3) Best point - Inuit - your suggestion is great because it roots out systemic disadvantage, rather than put a band-aid on a wound. A genuinely CANADIAN point (4) Helping Inuit population

Second Proposition

1) Tone/delivery - good, slow, engaging

2) Going up to formulate a plan - good reception of POI

3) Your security argument resounded very strongly with me. BUT... is this a real issue? I do not know. Provide me w/ an example of why it is. I personally imagine that this would be a greater issue in highly populated regions further south. Oil spills - good - but tell me more.

Judge's Comments: 4 - True north - very repetitive, 1bl rather see something else

1- TONE/delivery - slow down, stand still
2- Cost benefit arguments are highly convincing - force, that is great, simple argument
3- Your response to Norman's POI was highly informed.

REBUTTAL

1- Have a plan before going up - good argument - again, economic issue.
2- Nationalism and detrimental effects - also very good
3- Your delivery drastically improved here.

Second Opposition

1- TONE - good, slow, engaging, easy to process, highly organized.
2- You mentioned systemic disadvantage amongst people in the Arctic - BUT... tell me why your proposition's ~~benefits~~ creating outside advantage are better than those set out in the 1st proposition.

3) Imperialism/Costs argument - great... give me historical precedent, it's there. The American frontier? Something more current?
4) Tourism - great point - indeed, unless prop. can show otherwise, tourism benefits are so negligible
5- Canada's ~~tourism~~ - economic feasibility arguments were great.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: NATALYA SLEPNEVA

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: Spens 2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QUEBEC LS

Team Name: SASKATCHEWAN HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ERIC LAURIN JANNA SHAPIRO

NATASHA SALIM BRETTANY HAUGHEY

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>156</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>155</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Individual comments given in round.

RFD! While opposition had a lot of good material and presented their arguments in a very polished fashion, they did not engage sufficiently w/ non-military aspects of the proposition case, and did not ~~outline~~ convincingly outline the threat of war, largely as a result of focusing too much on the U.S.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

They gave some good material on other sovereignty claims, but ultimately did not clearly prove that other sovereignty claims outweighed Canada's.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Ross

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS-1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova-Scotia UP

Team Name: Quebec CM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelsey Keddy Jodie PaviG

David Marcovitch Melissa Cape

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

Score
69
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score

165
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

142
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments: Kelsey
First Proposition

Strong speaking style, great presentation.

Setting "Arctic" in NW Passage and areas only surrounded by Canada was a bit weak

Second Proposition

Very good speaking style - factual and engaging

Good testation and construction

You should spend 1-2 minutes

bringing up and reintroducing

your partners points

Judge's Comments: David
First Opposition

Took a few too many POI's - be a bit more confident in your speeches.

Good points about NATO security blanket and international agreements - could be fleshed out more.

Second Opposition

Confident speaking style

Great point about encouraging diplomacy, but needed to be

thashed out more

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aung Mya Kyaw

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: MS 1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia KP

First Speaker:

Kelsey Keaddy

Second Speaker:

Jeric Pattig

Score
83
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CM

First Speaker:

David Maronitch

Second Speaker:

Melissa Gape

Score
74
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score
162
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
151
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good Summary speech
- Model on bit low burden. You could say the whole Arctic, instead
- Good arguments - well developed.
- of just waters that pass through - Canada

Second Proposition

- Good Science points
- Good rebuttation
- Good point on sovereignty.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Too many POIs. Don't exchange with them
- 1st speech needs better structure. You did Refu, Const, Refu. Do const, then refu. Be more clear.
- Good summary speech.

Second Opposition

- ~~Too many POIs. Don't e~~
- Good point on diplomacy. Can be expanded a bit more.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ABHINAV GUPTA

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: MS-1

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA - KP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelsey Keddy

Jeric Pusig

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QUEBEC - CM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Macovitch

Melissa Cape

Score
<u>69</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>159</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>143</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Excellent defense of arguments, but careful with military strategy; if opposition called you on it you could have lost the arguments
- Watch "sportsmanship"
- Missed easy POI's to OPP

Second Proposition

- Strong delivery
- Covered all sides of arguments
- Handled POI's well
- Missed easy POI's to OPP

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Define concepts!
- Be careful to assume that the UN/international law has precedence (it does not here)
- Calm down/slow down
- Careful w/ wording (sounds too colloquial)
- Need more military research

Second Opposition

- Define concepts!
- Good rebuttals all around as you caught the point of the slippery slope immediately (military prep ≠ military intervention)
- Be careful with Refuting points with awkward/false analogies
- Better to skip the point altogether
- Need more military research.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ted M

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 1 Room: F2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario UL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denizhan Vykur

Valentin Litvin

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryn Meekel

Dylan Leman

Score
80
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score
162
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
~~First Proposition~~

What won you guys the round was your point about how the harms (environmental, economic) are inevitable - sov. gives us the ability to choose how we deal with them. Also it helped that they never disputed that more presence means more sovereignty - just that it wasn't worth it. Second speaker really brought the adaptation point across in refutation and had a nice tie, so kudos to him.

Good Debate,

Judge's Comments:
~~First Opposition~~

You guys simply didn't clash enough or impact enough. For example, in your environment point, you never once explained why cl, as Canada, should care if the Arctic has less ice. For a cold place, this could be a good thing. However, you two did have good stats/research and explanations of them. In the end, I didn't buy the UN Treaty make it sovereign, it's not an issue.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mwanzo Tshimbanga

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: Lucas Seminar

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC TD

Team Name: Quebec FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Denhoff Christian Taylor

Zouad Hassan Francesca Fagnoli

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score

152
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

151
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good speech. Work on shorter P.O.I.s and introductions.

Second Proposition

Work on coming up with more arguments that are distinct from your partner and you'll do well!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Solidify things with a deeper analysis and your points will stand strong

Second Opposition

Good speech. Try and think about the practical implications of what you say.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tracey Lee

No. of Judges: 1

Senior Round: 1

Room: Spiers 1

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MB FT

Team Name: QC TO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ella Thomson

Jaclyn Flom

Dan Ton-That

Jeremy Obrand

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Score
80
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
161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Very good speaker - clear & confident.

You set up the case well but spend a lot of time describing the situation in the Arctic rather than analyzing the issues at hand.

Second Proposition

You raise really good questions during your rebuttal & constructive matter but I would suggest that you spend a bit more time developing the answers to these questions.

Strong opening - an interesting proposal, "collaboration" as an alternative goal, but you needed to develop this further (what would this look like?).
Good reply!

Second Opposition

Good analysis - you dealt with some lines of argumentation that had to be addressed.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BRIAN CASEY

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: HISTORY

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ON KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elliot Karfman

Darrell Gray

Score
78
100

Score
84
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Albina SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim

Kat Suthwin

Score
82
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
165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

How do ↑ utility provide
non surplus & profit?
How does the model deliver
the benefits?

Second Proposition

If the choice is Regulation +
Development or no regulation +
Development. The gov't argument
prevails.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Efficient utility to logical problems
is gov't case

Second Opposition

Developers could and will operate
Called gov't or long termists

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Roger Smith
Ontario AW

No. of Judges: _____ Round: 1 Room: F4

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario AW

Team Name: Quebec H2

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nate Winsor

Concor Ahluwalia

Victor Zhao

Andrew Hamilton

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score
157
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

given in round

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Loudon

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: 1452

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta RL

Team Name: MB HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joan Lowledge

Tyson Lamb

Daniel Hueing

Allen Liu

Score
82
100

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score
164
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
165
200

PROPOSITION **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- points were well put forward
- final speech was well done with excellent analysis

not convinced that tragedy of common works on prop side better for opp?

All were excellent well prepared speakers, impressive

Second Proposition

- analysis is strong but it did not necessarily prove this sides points used to analyze speech

what defines the arctic? brought up on this side

deemphasizes vs. the arctic good points

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- strong effective speaker
 - brought forth excellent points
 - excellent rebuttal.
- very close round.

Second Opposition

- uses what is in the best interest of arctic
- interesting way to take on the clash.
- international diplomacy. length of development.

Canadian National Debating Championships

(8r)

Judge's Name: Jeany

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: 62

PROPOSITION

QC GB

Team Name: _____

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Megan G.

Karen Z.

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS NR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan N.

Shreeya G.

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score

162
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

147
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- ↳ Nice set up
- ↳ Good responses in Rebuttal
- ↳ seemed a bit nervous in 1st speech, relax!
- ↳ Excellent structure

Second Proposition

- ↳ Extremely intelligent responses
- ↳ VARY TONE → emphasize really smart pieces of refutation, because there weren't present.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- ↳ Get to clear quicker
- ↳ Good depth of knowledge
- ↳ But arguments about post failures don't really address key questions of the round

Second Opposition

- ↳ Great style!
- ↳ BUT too much time on one case/idea point 1 got to clear quicker
- ↳ Rebuild partner's points bring them back