

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ted M

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 2 Room: F2

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec FH

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Zawad Hassan Francesco Fagnoli

Score
85
100

Score
82
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Nova Scotia OB

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Debi Ogunrinde Oliver Björnsson

Score
86
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score
167
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
170
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

~~First Proposition~~ well-organized speeches overall, did run into a bit of trouble adapting to Opposition case. you two seemed strangely unprepared for the environment point apart from be as environmentally friendly as possible. you

~~Second Proposition~~ guys lose the geopolitical point since sending in resources ~~to~~ to exclude other nations probably does increase tensions, which unfortunately decided the Round.

Judge's Comments:

~~First Opposition~~ Good speeches as well, and good POIs. The environment point didn't really sway me - you proved why global warming is bad for fish, but the impact on humans remained a bit muted. The econ. point was

~~Second Opposition~~ a wash since neither team had many numbers. good job on the politics of the issue.

WEIGHT and good luck!

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MARK LAZAR

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Geography

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia M.S

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julia Milden      Zack Santella

Score
85
100

Score
80
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Megan Gagliano      Karen Bott

Score
87
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
165
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
160
200

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

You were the best debater I saw today - good structure arguments + refute windup - You missed some good refutes "NWP is not a shipping lane" Great POI Q+A. Impressive def. of topic

**Second Proposition**

Good style & information - not strong on picking strong refutes, make - Good new point development in your 2nd half -

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

Great speaking style - and info - too much emphasis on peaceful ~~save~~ maintenance of territory w/o presence - Rebuttal did not deconstruct the Proposition's definition

**Second Opposition**

You defined things well, but looked uncomfortable information you added did not ~~challenge~~ challenge the Proposition too much. Poor POI responses.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ryan Rogers

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

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia - MS

Team Name: Québec - GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julia Milden

Zack Santella

Megan Gagliano

Karen Butt

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>160</u>
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<u>156</u>
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Feels too much like you are reading your speech, try and avoid this
  - Make sure to define all key terms in the debate (ex. Arctic)
  - Effectively outlined the threats to Arctic sovereignty
  - Spoke a little fast at times - try and manage time better
  - Solid, concise constructive material
  - Excellent POI to Karen (mandate of Arctic Council)
  - How does your plan help indigenous groups' issues?
  - Solid build down, themes summarized the round well
- Second Proposition

- Opp does not necessarily have to show harms, they took an approach is showing your bill is unnecessary
- Your rebuttal seemed a bit unorganized
- Talked about potential for trade routes and oil/gas reserves in the Arctic
- Good eye contact
- I would have liked your constructive material to be presented in a more organized manner - clear points and sub-headings

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Side could have brought more substantive constructive material to the round
- Great speaking style + eye contact
- Very good constructive material
- Emphasized the viability of diplomacy and lack of true pressing threat posed by nations like Russia
- We don't stop ships in the Pacific, but Pacific Ocean is also not anyone's sovereign land
- Good references to the Arctic Council as a means of resolving issues
- Solid build down which made sense of key issues in the round

Second Opposition

- Effectively articulated the limitations of the resource extraction potential in the Arctic
- Struggled to sufficiently answer an excellent POI from Karen about the mandate of the Arctic Council
- More organization and focus in your speech could be beneficial; it felt like it dragged a bit at times

RFD → Despite a close debate, Opp accepted the notion that sovereignty was important, but they tried to prove this could be done purely through diplomatic means, however Prop thoroughly refuted these.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Cameron

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Geo

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia - MS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julia Milden

Zack Santella

Score
87
100

Score
78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec - GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Meagan Gagliano

Karen Butt

Score
75
100

Score
70
100

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

Team Score

165
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<del>145</del> 145
200

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- spoke a little quickly, robbed yourself of the opportunity to emphasize certain arguments using pauses or a change in tone.

++ very clear, pointed and confident presentation. Well organized speech.

Second Proposition

- poor accommodation of Opposition's POI's.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- missed out on some important points of rebuttal such as environmental impact.

+ was very effective at curtly dismissing the points she wanted to refute and leave behind.

Second Opposition

- weak rebuttal to Prop's POI's.

frequent use of "like" detracted from the strength of your speeches.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aung Mya Kyaw

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: MS1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: HW Manitoba

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anthony Wightman Michael Honke

Score
<del>77</del> 77
100

Score
70
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec LS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Janna Shapiro Eric Laurin

Score
74
100

Score
72
100

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

Team Score

147
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

146
200

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- ⊗ Need to develop argument more. Don't just recite examples.
- ⊗ Model needs to be more specific in beginning.
- ⊗ Explain examples more clearly

**Second Proposition**

- ⊗ Need better structure; differentiate constructive and rebuttal.
- ⊗ Organize points better, don't muddle them.

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- ⊗ Have ~~more~~ a stronger stance. Say why doing this is bad instead of saying there are <sup>other</sup> better things to do.
- ⊗ Good summary speech
- ⊗ Talk more about diplomacy when you say others have claims.

**Second Opposition**

- ⊗ Good rebuttals
- ⊗ Good point on pollution
- ⊗ Don't assume what First Nations people want

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jordan Gentile

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: F3

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia AR

First Speaker:

Madeleine Armstrong

Second Speaker:

Sonam Rai

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario NM

First Speaker:

Kaitlyn Melache

Second Speaker:

Norman Nehmetallah

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>75</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>152</u>
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition - Good use of POIs

- Good quiz statement and road-mappers
- The first argument was well developed but the second point was only addressed at Tim, make sure to leave more time
- Rebuttal <sup>speech</sup> was well done and addressed the key arguments but not <sup>only</sup> well argued

**Second Proposition** - Good use of POIs

- Rebuttal was well done yet it took up 5min of your speech, leave more time for your argument and rebuttal
- Good constructive arguments but could have been a bit more organized
- Better your time management

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition - Good use of POIs

- Rebuttal at the <sup>beginning</sup> of the speech was very well done
- Excellent point construction by arguments that were well pushed out
- Try to better use the time at the end of your speech
- Good rebuttal speech but maybe take more time for your main "clash" points

**Second Opposition** - Good use of POIs

- Good job in including rebuttal into your constructive point
- Well developed rebuttal but maybe take some time to rebuttal your partner's points
- Add a bit more substance to your speech

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kate Rochford

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: French 3

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeline Armstrong

Senam Rai

Score
76
100

Score
80
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kathryn Meloche

Norman

Score
78
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

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

ROAD MAP!

- good definition/model
- needed more refutation/response ~~in~~ in 2<sup>nd</sup> speech.
- structure
- keep asking WHY?

Second Proposition

- you need to manage your time.  
↳ you ran out.
- good POI
- solid refutation

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- TIME MANAGEMENT
- good refutation  
↳ it could have been done w/ your points
- Inuit point was EXTREMELY paternalistic.
- spend more time on points/analysis  
↳ keep asking WHY.

Second Opposition

- Argument lacked "meat"
- refutation was repetitive
- good style

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Catherine Holloway

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: French 3

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: British Columbia AR

Team Name: Ontario NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeleine Armstrong      Sonam Rai

Kaitlyn Meloche      Norman Nehmeallah

Score
75
100

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score

154
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

153
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Organization problems  
made solid content  
difficult to follow  
Take the time to make your  
structure clearer.

Second Proposition

Time management problems  
didn't leave you enough  
time for your constructive  
points.  
However, your refutation  
was strong.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Your refutation found  
order in a sea of information  
However, you didn't really  
capitalize on your main  
points  
Strong speaking style  
but needs more substance

Second Opposition

Your major argument came from  
a weak position - "we can't  
do it"  
Constructive points need more  
substance



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Deirdre Casey

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2<sup>HS</sup> Room: History

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NWT - HS

Team Name: Sask - SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Greg Hanna

Emily Smith

Areeb Salim

Nasra Moumin

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

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

Team Score
152
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
163
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Careful re: confusion about what parts of Arctic officially belong to Canada vs. asserting Canadian dominance
- by defining so vastly you take on lots of burdens, be prepared to defend all of them

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Really good refutation
- make sure you deal with the strongest form of all arguments as opposed to straw manning

(For both)

Second Proposition

- make sure to explicitly tie back your arguments to your plan
- ↳ ex. how is your plan absolutely necessary to general environmental initiatives
- ↳ This will strengthen all your points!
- military is most important argument so spend more time refuting it

Second Opposition

- Great POIs!
- deal with non-military arguments more explicitly so it doesn't seem like you are ignoring them

RFD: Prop took on too many burdens and they couldn't prove all of them. Though it would be good for opp to deal more w/ other individual arguments, military analysis was convincing enough + proven to be more important than other issues.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: T. Lee

No. of Judges: 1

Senior Round: 2

Room: Spiel 1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: AB ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryn Meekel

Dylan Leman

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - PT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Pistorius

Adrienne Tessier

Score
81
100

Score
81
100

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

Team Score

158
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

162
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- good knowledge base,  
you've clearly researched  
the issues thoroughly.  
Don't forget to use your  
model as you run  
through your arguments

Second Proposition

Some good ideas,  
more organization +  
structure ~~is~~ would  
have helped bring  
your ideas together  
into stronger arguments

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- strong rebuttal -  
good strategy to  
illuminate tension in  
their case  
Your constructive rather  
became quite embedded  
into your rebuttal (seemed  
indistinct at  
times)

Second Opposition

Good clarity overall -  
you were able to  
highlight the areas of  
clash effectively

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: AMIC KHOUZAM

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: EN-1

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec HZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Hamilton      Vidar Zhou

Score
80
100

Score
77
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: SASKATHEWAN FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aaron Fritzer      Arthur Hamilton

Score
79
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score
157
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
153
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Good opening speech  
- good spread of points  
- slow down a little  
- Good boil down summary, etc. watch time, but excellent synthesis of key themes.

Second Proposition

Slow down.  
- More P.O.I's, both given and taken, but good fleshing out of points  
- adequate rebuttal, leave more time for rebuttal.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Good presentation, be careful of alternative model and make sure you can back it up with solid examples/arguments/alternatives.  
- good rebuttal.  
- in final speech, synthesize more fully.

Second Opposition

- Watch your time, careful not to read your speech.  
Good bringing up of the conference & environmental issue.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Theo McLaughlin

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2 <sup>Senior</sup> Room: E 1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec HZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Hamilton

Victor Zhao

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aaron Fritsker

Arthur Hamilton

Score
78
100

Score
72
100

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

Team Score

152
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

150
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

at first  
Clear plan<sup>th</sup> but it did get a little open-ended w/ future implications. However I did think it tried to have it both ways, in the sense ~~that~~ of whether there were contentious claims to the spoken well. NWP.

**Second Proposition** but needed way more  
I think the core was the necessity of a coast guard presence to enforce a claim; this came through

You had some good responses, but not quite substantive enough on the ~~cost~~ effectiveness of the coast guard. ~~The~~ The distinction with imperialism was clear. You should try to slow down and use "like" less.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

A polished speaker. However, your reputation rested on there being a better alternative in diplomacy, which you then developed insufficiently. You hit the key points in the rebuttal speech but we didn't have enough by that point.

**Second Opposition**

You had a strong response on Prop needing to be clearer and trying to have it both ways, but you could have done a lot more. Be more confident. You're a good speaker; stand your ground, ~~and~~ take fewer PDI's & give more.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Emanuel Siman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: English 1

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec HZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Hamilton      Victor Zhao

Score
78
100

Score
73
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Saskatchewan FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aaron Fritzer      Arthur Hamilton

Score
79
100

Score
71
100

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

Team Score
151
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
150
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Made very good points
- Pivotal POT's
- Could slow down a bit, enunciate more clearly
- Could use better time-management

Second Proposition

- well-organized arguments
- Said "like" too much
- good rebuttals of opposition points

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Very poised and confident speaker
- used good examples
- Did not organize arguments that well
- Main arguments got muddled with rebuttal

Second Opposition

- could have given more POT's
- Good organizational/mapping out
- could improve style
- well-organized

Canadian National Debating Championships

MATH

Judge's Name: BAM LAZAN

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M53

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NOVA scotia NR

Team Name: ALBERTA HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

RYAN NEARING

BHREAGH ROSS

MATTHEW LEE

Michael HOSKINS

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

Score
75
100

Score
86
100

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

Team Score	155
	200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score	161
	200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition (Ryan)

STYLE

GOOD COMMAND OF MATERIAL  
STRONG PRESENCE

- Need
- NAT Identity ✓
- TRADE ✓
- ECONOMIC SPIN OFF
- POI - ARCTIC ENVIRONMENT
- SUMMARY ✓

- INT'L TENSION
- ECONOMIC STIMULATION
- ENVIRON. RECORD
- GLOBAL WARMING
- PLAN FOR FUTURE

clean energy?

Second Proposition

- Resource Argument - MID EAST? 8'10"
- oil RUNNING out - NAT GAS
- other energy?

- Repetition
- reading too fast + STUMBLER

CLUTTER  
YR BUT  
UM  
AND AS I'VE SAID

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition (LEE)

STYLE 8'16"

- STRONG

- tension w. others
- FIN → military presence?
- NW PASSAGE - trade route
- poor command of fact.
- rhetorical rather than facts
- "HYPOTHETICAL" ENV. IMPLICATIONS

3 pillars? - oil production is unproductive

- innovation vs expansion
- explore vs exploitation

Second Opposition

repeats open remarks "I have a lot of things to say and not a lot of time to say it."

Pillar - Can Identity - Ref. True North Strong and free

- SHIPS so many, whether or not we have sovereignty
- good SUMMARY of arguments
- ✓ strong argument re oil exploitation

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. Liferovich

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M-3

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia - NR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Neeshy

Bhrough Ross

Score
80
100

Score
83
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hopkins

Score
81
100

Score
85
100

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

Team Score

163
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

### Judge's Comments:

#### First Proposition

- False sense of urgency.
- Specify where Arctic is huge.
- Is charging fees legal?
- Rebuttal:
  - Canada invaded Iraq? No.
- Ignored erratic weather deeper point.

#### Second Proposition

- "self-sufficiency" has negative connotations to come.
- don't need presence for accountability on environment
- not "if" but "when" is a weak argument
- Tech could be better in future
- "north makes significant contribution"

### Judge's Comments:

#### First Opposition

- Good argument against stimulus.
- Needs to deal with transit fee argument better.
- The depth of your voice is engaging

#### Rebuttal:

- Good closing.

#### Second Opposition

- used same opening as per team - not a big deal, but lazy.
- "most politically strained in the world" - Balkans? (Hyperbole)
- Great POI answers. Very impressive!!
- Norton Rose is a law firm. Maybe they cited a geologist?

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: W. BARUK

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M3

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA (NR)

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Nearing

Bhreeagh Ross

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ALBERTA HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Score
82
100

Score
85
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

<u>167</u>
200

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Arguments well-constructed, well-supported & topical
- Some error in presentation

Second Proposition

- Good style, level presentation
- Supported the case with sound arguments

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Rebuttal was well done outlined questions & responded well to a line

Second Opposition

- Excellent speech, sound analysis of problems and possible solutions
- Presentation clear & to the point - easy to understand
- Effective delivery



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: EDWARD BECHARD

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: Math-1

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sask ZK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rainer Kocsis

Kelly Zheng

Score
81
100

Score
79
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario Aw

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Connor Ahluwalia

Nate Winsor

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

160
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

154
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Comments given

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

orally.

Reason for decision: Govt outlined military-based method of solidifying + enforcing legal title over the arctic. Opposition had lost this round by, on different occasions, just denying gov'ts factual claims, by highlighting non-exclusive alternatives, and developing claims that were -within the context of what government had outlined - exaggerated.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Veenu No. of Judges: 1 Round: <sup>(80)</sup> 2 Room: E2

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario KK

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

Toe-Mu Kim Anson Kinoshita

Score
86
100

Score
83
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: MS FT

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

Judith Chan Gilla Thomson

Score
84
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score
169
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- ↳ Excellent PM speech
- ↳ rebuttal could've hammered home a few really important points from Opp more, rather than trying to cover everything.
- Stick to stuff that has become relevant.

**Second Proposition**

- ↳ 1st job dealing w/ opposing forces still
- ↳ well developed argument
- ↳ **SPEAK SLOWER** → really, really imp for you
- ↳

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- ↳ Great time Margaret & genuine rebuttal
- ↳ Variety of arguments good
- Wanna
- ↳ ~~the~~ need to test capacity stuff to deal
- spend less time on it & more on

**Second Opposition**

- ↳ 1st job hitting all prop points, issue very
- frst content of rebuttal wasn't sufficient.
- ↳ Got backing of opp, other
- ↳ Bed w/ speaker before you
- wave

Great round!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Chihab Elk

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2(Sr) Room: Red Room

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec - BR

Team Name: Newfoundland - RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sarah Battat      Sabrina Roy

Michael Sullivan      Daniel Rees

Score
84 <sup>84</sup>
100

Score
78 <sup>88</sup>
100

Score
81 <sup>81</sup>
100

Score
82 <sup>82</sup>
100

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

Team Score

162
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

163
200

~~PROPOSITION~~

OPPOSITION

OPP WON!!

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- ⊛ Great speech!
- ⊛ Good structure, good summary speech
- ⊛ Second argument needed more development to explain why military is important to improve environment

- ⊛ Good structure, good summary
- ⊛ Refutation was strong, be careful not to admit that Canada could be under threat.
- ⊛ ~~Arg~~ Identification of burdens was excellent.

Second Proposition

- ⊛ Need to explain the link between military presence & northern cultural preservation
- ⊛ Good structure, refutation was on point!
- ⊛ Careful about the "like"s

Second Opposition

- ⊛ Very good speech overall
- ⊛ Lacked time for last arguments / rebuilding, but you did a good refutation

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julie Hooton

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Red Room

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec BR.

First Speaker:

Sarah Battat

Second Speaker:

Sabrina Roy

Score
84
100

Score
78
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Newfoundland RS

First Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Second Speaker:

Daniel Lees

Score
84
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
162
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Expressed ideas passionately & articulately.  
Clear ideas and facts well-marshalled  
Presented many arguments to address main reasons to support the Proposition  
Handled POI well  
summary: clearly expressed points to counter opp.  
Articulate & passionate presentation

Second Proposition

Laid out plan for this speech clearly.  
Spoke effectively to build up all aspects to make the cultural significance point, a strong one.  
Well done.  
Did a fine job of addressing opps points in rebuttal. Be careful to definitively address POI  
Watch getting caught in verbal "tic" of "like"

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Very good statement of the issues at hand which must be proved for 1 side to win.  
Rebuttal was well done as was handling of POI  
Good summary of position.  
Articulate presentation.  
Summary: well-organized. Answering 3 questions is good, strong format. (And final statement itself was good)  
be careful not to talk over PRO

Second Opposition

Clear plan for speech laid out  
Very good rebuttal, particularly on the social/cultural aspects for Inuit population  
clear statement of "trying to solve problems that don't exist and not only that, but PRO would create problems" ← effective  
Addressed POI well  
Good recap of first opp's statement.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: WEIGEL, Melvin

No. of Judges: 3

Round:      Room: red

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: QUEBEC-BR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sarah Battat

Sabrina Roy

Score
84
100

Score
79
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Newfoundland - RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Rees

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

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

Team Score
163
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
161
200

one hundred and sixty three **PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

one hundred and sixty one W/M/W

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- mining found in ~~the~~ arctic
- uses specific, precise, contextual examples BUT did not meet promise to explain extent of CDA's claim.
- clear exposition of relevant points
- "the Danish"
- good ∴ protect these Canadians and their way of life
- "of of ..." not clearly defined

**Second Proposition**

- did not allow 2 POI -
- so much information - spoke a little too fast

- "such spiritual beings"
- land important to them
- tribal values
- govt obligation to support - France tried to assimilate them
- \$50 bill icebreaker - ties to natives
- "like..." 2x "um"

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- ~~POI~~
- "icebreakers destroy lifestyle of those living on ice"
- 2nd opp thinks well on his feet
- "war will militarily presence improve links to land"
- "perpetrating our borders"
- "live on the ice for seasons of the year"

**Second Opposition**

- "it's not like..." is off
- both 2nd prop & 1st opp used "a bunch of" - vague term
- 2nd prop ~~like~~ like 5x
- Fathers to go + exploit them
- subliminal - to use w/ exploitation

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: PETER SEELAGYE

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: MATH 2

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: AB - SV

Team Name: ON - SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zach Shapiro

Christopher Virtue

Tarany Marathe

Alastair Smith

Score
83
100

Score
81
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

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

(pm)

Judge's Name: Justin Kuznicki

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M2

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Alberta

Team Name: Ontario

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zack Shapiro

Chris Virtue

Tarang Matathe

Alastair Smith

Score
<del>84</del> 84
100

Score
79
100

Score
<del>84</del> 84
100

Score
81
100

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

Team Score

163
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

162
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M.K. Jackson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: MAN 2

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - SV

Team Name: Ant - SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zack Shapiro  
~~Jarong Marathe~~      Christopher Virtan

Jarong Marathe      Alastair Smith

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>84</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>104</u>
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<u>106</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: Brian Casey

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: Spina Seminar

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CM.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dawn McConville

Melina Capri

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sasha Kalkan W-X

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Chris Waddell

Jason Xin

Score
80
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score
160
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

The fault line was well argued by all teams

Second Proposition

Good description

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Is the situation exacerbated with greater the role?

Second Opposition

Very good speech by Kyle - very effective rebuttal.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mwanzo Tshimbanga

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: Lucas seminar

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta KC

Team Name: NS - FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Stephen Cho      Alif Karmali

Austin Flynn      Clarissa Brisson

Score
82
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
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
160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

Good Speech and arguments.  
Congrats!  
Spent a little more time in  
your reply.

**Second Proposition**

Interesting reputation. Expand  
on it a little and you'll do  
great.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

Great job. Watch the assertions  
and try to really make the  
connections.

**Second Opposition**

Liked your speech. Prove to us  
why Russia would find us  
a threat.  
Great job!

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: CAROLINE WAGNER

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: Chem Lab

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC-OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Shervin Yousef-Zadch      Yesha Ouyang

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba-GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

JJ Gerstein      Ariel Melamedoff

Score
82
100

Score
<del>80</del> 83
100

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

Team Score
159
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
165
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

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

The contradiction between whether you meant the Arche as in your definition or the North became problematic

→ The issue of hostility & sovereignty relies in undisputed territories

→ The natural resources are also here

**Second Proposition** what was interesting was talks about Canada being unaware of ships through the north but it felt like 2 separate cases.

But you're both great speakers

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

Well done pointing out the inconsistency but still developing your case.

Both are good speakers.

**Second Opposition**

Canadian National Debating Championships

SRS.

Judge's Name: Caroline Mei

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2 Room: BIO LAB

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

Team Name: Quebec KM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christoph Pilke

LEO Plumer

Emily Michelin

Emma Katz

Score
75
100

Score
72
100

Score
73
100

Score
73
100

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

75  
72  
147

Team Score
147
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
146
200

73  
73  
146

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

The round went to prop- to centerpiece w/ Arctic colonization well thought out, although well-intentioned. Refutation was lacking on both sides. The strongest constructive material came out in the P.M.C. speech. Don't forget to keep P.O.s brief and to the point. Be more confident in your delivery.

Overall, I felt opp's decision may not have been well-intentioned. The strongest constructive material came out in the P.M.C. speech and to the point.

Second Proposition

Good luck @ the rest of the tournament and in future :)

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Roger Smith

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: F4

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: BC-KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Armaan Kassar

Jasmit Dumas

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Nova Scotia KP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelsey Kelly

Terri Parry

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

- too much model makes it unclear
- security or development are both good directions; pick one

Second Proposition

- economic and environment analysis solid
- human security could be developed better

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- why does Canada have right? → excellent question
- economic analysis weird (profit from total detachment?)  
↳ also <sup>does</sup> status quo = development?
- excellent summary

Second Opposition

- implications of monetary expansion - good point
- Canadian image - less strong

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tristano Tenaglia

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: E3

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba H.L.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Allen Liu

Daniel Huang

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario HC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daniel Chiang

Elliot Kaufman

Score
75
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

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

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

Introduction was very well brought-up, however the facts involved were clearly not well researched. Try to be more firm in your points, however this is difficult when the facts haven't already been well developed.

**Second Proposition**

Although the speech was very well-delivered the points discussed were evidently just broadening the first prop. and new, sustainable points were not discussed. Do not reject so many POIs, and try to take at least one early one.

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

Good job done to directly attack the prop but you must take some POIs. Not taking and rejecting so many makes it seem like you're not ready to discuss your topics. Be more open to issues made by the opposing team and use them to your advantage.

**Second Opposition**

Good job on taking POIs because rest of group rejected all early points. Handled yourself very well and made good counters to the prop. However discussing benefit for Inuits is rather invalid. Do more research

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: GENE BUERGER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: EWENTH 3

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: MANITOBA HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ALLEN LIU

DANIEL HUANG

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ~~MANITOBA HL~~ ONTARIO KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

DANIEL CHIANG

ELLIOT KAUFMAN

Score
76
100

Score
79
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 ALLEN LIU

MR LIU Laid out a two-pronged case but the second half was not well developed.

Neither "significant" nor "presence" were adequately defined.

Second Proposition DANIEL HUANG

Handled "disputed territories" point well

Handled vulnerable population well

VERY LITTLE SPECIFIC INFORMATION IN THIS AFFIRMATIVE CASE - EITHER ABOUT THE STATUS QVO OR DETAILS OF A PLAN.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition DANIEL CHIANG

MR CHIANG'S SUGGESTION THAT THE GOV'T SPEND MONEY ONLY IN ADULTERED AREAS WAS RISKY

NOT FAMILIAR WITH HOW CONSTRUCTION OR RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT HAPPEN

Second Opposition ELLIOT KAUFMAN

"TOO LATE FOR MORE RESEARCH POINT" WAS WELL MADE

REBANDDED EFFECTIVELY TO THE INUIT CULTURE POINT

NOT MUCH DETAIL IN THE NEGATIVE CASE EITHER, NOR MUCH UNDERSTANDING OF THE ARCTIC. SHOULD HAVE HELD PROP. RESPONSIBLE FOR NOT MEETING THE BURDEN OF PROOF

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Amanda Siing

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: E3

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: MAHL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Allen Liu

Daniel Huang

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ONKC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daniel Chiang

Elliot Kaufman

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>152</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<u>154</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

If you introduce science & surveillance talk about BOTH!  
Don't mention one at the beginning and the end, it was almost irrelevant.  
If Opp seems to need clarification at the beginning, give it to them - you don't lose anything by take 15 seconds to clarify.

Second Proposition

Don't defend your model with empty words like absurdity. Defend your model by defending your points.

Overall great presentation, POIs, but little substance.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

If you have a problem with the model, bring it up at the beginning and let it go. The judges will know. Just ~~keep~~ <sup>model</sup> tell us where one argument/points short.

Second Opposition

Your point could have been made a bit more clearly, it meddled a bit with your reputation a bit too much.



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Natalya

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: Specs 2

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Alberta SK

Team Name: British Columbia TD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim

Kat Sviknmushin

David Denhoff

Christain Taylor

Score
85
100

Score
84
100

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
169
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Proposition set up a clear + compelling case for increasing presence in the Arctic based on military threats, potential for use of resources, and increased quality of life in the North, and engaged in good comparative analysis demonstrating that Canada was the best actor to stake out its claim. While opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

did a good job of setting up alternative claims over sovereignty of the Northwest passage, they did not deal directly with many proposition points, especially the comparative analysis.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Elizabeth Winans

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: ~~MS4~~ MS4

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: NSDM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff

Blair MacNeil

Score
81
100

Score
82
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - RL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joan Rowledge

Jason Lamb

Score
81
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

160
200

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

RFD

Although Opp did an excellent job examining the long-term harms to taking this action, there was insufficient explanation of why ~~this would be worse for Canada~~ forgoing the opportunity would be better for Canada, and gov. sufficiently proved ① the benefits and ② the inefficacy of the proposed counter-plan, esp. given intense competition and other threats/those consequences to Canada.

Second Proposition

Alyson: • excellent organization/ case-line  
• could have elaborated more on the benefits, in stead of just the way to receive the benefits

Blaine: • slightly disorganized  
• great analysis  
• excellent refutation to countercase

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Joan: • very eloquent speaker  
• good explanation of tragedy of the commons  
↳ good examples  
• could have used more focus on why it would have worked (not just why it's good)

Jason: • excellent description of economic problems → be wary of resource arguments  
• good use of P.O.I.s

Second Opposition

Should significantly increase its presence in the Arctic  
**Canadian National Debating Championships**

Judge's Name: Baty

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

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: UN Wfld.

Team Name: Thornhill - out.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Morgan Walsh

Kate McNeil

Devon Utker

Valentina Litvin

Score
75
100

Score
78
100

Score
85
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score
154
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
169
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- points of arctic assets & sovereignty unsubstantiated. Rhetoric → evidence needed to anchor <sup>initial</sup> argument. Central issue of force avoided, ultimately in favor of 'science' → historical naivety.

- 'information' showed up late. (last speech) ~~also did strength of presentation.~~

**Second Proposition**

Generally esoteric vs. realistic understanding of power.

- did a good job establishing connection between need for knowledge & survival of arctic as an ecosystem. Again, it would be nice if debaters anchored rhetoric in actual information. Did not deal with activity yields conflict over control of resources. attacks.

- though reference to agreement is made, for some reason a direct quotation was not used - convincing nonetheless - resource control ours - did show functional problem in ignoring potential conflict.

- clear as for an mutual exclusivity - clear cooperation in final statement - use direct quotation or stat occasionally.

**Second Opposition**

- used a 'harsh reality' of power politics (hard case) vs. eco. (soft case) to separate positions well. Ironically <sup>then</sup> back with a cooperation (soft case) strategy to counter effect - clever package.

- needed foundation in concrete info to make more credible course.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Marianne Amar

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: North Lab 10MP.

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland - WN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Margan Walsh

Kate McNeil

Score
75
100

Score
79
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario UL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denizhan Vykar

Valentin Litvin

Score
86
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score
154
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
170
200

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

to easy arguments  
be carefull with hands posture

Second Proposition

to easy arguments  
good speaker

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

good content!  
~~the~~ make me believe you.  
Nice examples

Second Opposition

good content!  
nice strategy

team spirit = very good

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katarina Daniels

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: N. comp. lab

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: WN- Newfoundland

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Morgan Walsh

Kate McNeil

Score
75
100

Score
80
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario - UL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denizhan Uykur

Valentin Litvin

Score
89
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score

155
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

172
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- interesting to go w/ the scientific approach.
- speaks too quickly → stumbles.
- strong research in Cdn geography.

**CLOSING:**

° didn't listen to opposition?  
Closing arg. based on what you hoped they would say?  
Ex: military.

**Second Proposition**

- UM! → watch that as it is distracting.
- Strong research in Cdn geography.

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- good organization & expressive dealing w/ unexpected def'n of presence.
- good int'l research.
- strong refutation.

**CLOSING:** - good summary  
- highlighted flaws in prop.  
- great bringing it back to yr main argument re: coop!

**Second Opposition**

- did a good job at using your planned argument (arms race) that wouldn't necessarily fit w/ the prop's def'n of "presence"
- good grasp of int'l real politik.  
\$ int'l collaboration
- work on enunciating (better w/ prepared topic).

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Loeber

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M52

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: SK HS

Team Name: Manitoba ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brittany Houghley Nitasha Salim

Nic Martin Thomas Lamothe

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>86</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>166.</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<u>168</u>
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- excellent points, well developed  
- brought forth prop. points and built a great case.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- rebuttal was well put together and extremely effective  
- points were strong and well constructed.

4 min summary was interesting

All of you are excellent speakers

4 min. very well done excellent! Am!

Second Proposition

- good for you to continue after sickness.  
- negotiate from a point of power - interesting  
- analysis was strong and had structure.

Second Opposition

- environmental reputation good point  
- economic points well solid.

excellent round. — well done.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ABHINAV GUPTA

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: MS-2

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SASKATCHEWAN-HS

Team Name: MANITOBA-ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brittany Haughey

Nitasha Selim

Nic Martin

Thomas Landbe

Score
80
100

Score
74
100

Score
85
100

Score
74
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

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Should elaborate on military points -- could have had stronger arguments if you had more military research
- Strong delivery
- accept PO's!

- Excellent delivery
- Excellent organization/poutline
- Careful overusing the Does joke...
- Don't rely on international law as a credible argument when discussing sovereignty

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

- Excellent rebuttal; you picked up on holes in OPP's arguments (like Diplomacy often requiring military)
- Try not to fill time; if no more to say, say no more!

- Careful discussing econ. concepts like Op-Cost as in the context you describe it, it is far more complex.
- Meet your partner's enthusiasm! (You speak second so we have expect others...)

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Ross

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

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan HS

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

Brittany \_\_\_\_\_ Nitasha Salim \_\_\_\_\_

Score
84
100

Score
78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba ML

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

Nic Mattin \_\_\_\_\_ Thomas Lamothe \_\_\_\_\_

Score
86
100

Score
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
167
200

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Proposition** Good Speaking Style

I liked the point about sovereignty - I would use it more as a reason why we deserve/have best claim to sovereignty, rather than as a reason why we actually have it.

Good hand + POIS

**Second Proposition**

Good Speech

Good Points on existing escalation

Point about backing up diplomacy with force is good, but needs explanation as to how Canada could credibly do that.

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Opposition** Great speech, good style,

you speak a bit fast but it isn't too much of an issue.

Good rebuttal and clash - about point about need for diplomacy and inability of Canada to succeed in a conflict of muscle

**Take more POIS**  
**Second Opposition**

Good style and speech,

The environment point was a bit weak - if we don't drill (as you recognise we could cause damage) others might.

Great point about confidence to get international law boosts support and power at negotiating table



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: VINAY DESAI

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: MS-3

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: MANITOBA - SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kirsten Solmundson

Helen Beaumont

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BRITISH COLUMBIA - EL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amina Egeh

Terry Lee

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
164
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- Structure & planning of your speech was very good → allowed for more coherency
- Summary speech was well-done; dealt with the key ideas & points

**Second Proposition**

- great organisation of your speech & use of your time, I was able to follow along very well

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- Structure of your speech was good (starting with how status quo is already good & also how this plan will be bad)
- Spoke well
- Try to discuss your points more rather than talk ideals. (constructive)

**Second Opposition**

- ~~Plan~~ Environment point was a little weak,
- gave great POI's that worked well to get the prop side-tracked in their speech.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Nicolas Méthot

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M53

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: MB-SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kirsten Schwindson

Helen Beaumont

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-EL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

AMINA EGHA

Terry Lee

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
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>157</u>
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- Strong speech:
- > little bit more diversity in points would have been nice.
- Good POI usage/taking
- Strong rebuttal

**Second Proposition**

- lost points on content, had a few points that could have been developed more.
- Also, US are going to nuke us.
- More POIs would be good.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- Good research !!
- Good material, structure was a bit weak, needed a bit more ideas/less facts.
- Good POIs.

**Second Opposition**

- Good speech, fill time next time.
- POIs were okay.
- Strong research/structure.
- Refutation suffered/had a few inconsistencies.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Christian Dugas

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M53

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kirsten Selmundson

Helen Beaumont

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia E2

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amina Egeh

Terry Lee

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>155</u>
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<u>156</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

Well structured

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

Too much focus on facts vs  
Their meaning, implications.

**Second Proposition**

Lack of development

**Second Opposition**

Some contradictions

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Debra MIKO

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 2

Room: F1

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: QC TO

Team Name: NS-DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dan Ton-That      Jeremy Obrant

Will Dawson      Rebecca Sutton

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

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

Team Score

168
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

163
200

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Great Stats. Nice sign posting.  
Great pause for effect.  
Well laid out opening  
Well Done!

Second Proposition

On our land belongs to us. We need to get our resources before someone else does.  
North West Passage!  
Good sign posting.  
Please pause for effect.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Great focus on clash.  
Nice speech.  
Certainly lots of research.  
Prop "never" said they wanted the military to start a war.

Second Opposition

NO REPUTATION ON HELPING OUR POPULATION to help them create stability by providing work; etc.  
Watch what you contradict.  
Great sign posting.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jon McCANIC

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 2 Room: Physics Lab

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia - UT

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

Ben Turner \_\_\_\_\_ Zephi Kramer \_\_\_\_\_

Score
81
100

Score
92
100

90

Changed due to score limits

Team Score
173
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask - Regina

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

Abdul-Behman \_\_\_\_\_ Gulraiz Tameer \_\_\_\_\_

Score
<del>81</del>
100

Score
86
100

Team Score
167
200

### Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- 1 - Great tone and delivery
- 2 - Questioned talking about systemic disadvantage amongst Canadian first Nations. But how does military presence ameliorate this? Is it just the first step why not just send up borders by social workers?
- 3 - Good - saw wit to reassure will be getting ROI.

- 4 - I like your metaphor of THW KE - gives me good feeling - hits at an emotional level - good "pay-back"
- 5 - Good fact - environmental impact of exploiting resources.
- 6 - Military presence - good idea that you need enforcement of shipping lanes, safe conduct, etc.

### Second Proposition

- 1 - Looking toward the future - good start
- 2 - Good idea - that we have money to invest in presence but not in helping First Nations
- 3 - "Doubling the environmental damage" -- I'm not sure whether this is true, but you were great to point out that there is no data to back that up.
- 4 - Global warming - well researched -
- 5 - "Building infrastructure today" - great justification - and you are making yourself seem like you have long-term vision
- 6 - Water issue is very well-researched & convincing
- 7 - Overall... GREAT, you make points - many of which I'm not sure I agree with - but you cite facts brilliantly and convince me. You hold my attention throughout. Great eye contact & delivery!

### Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- 1 - Delivery - stop swaying back & forth.
- 2 - Good - how is military presence decreasing systemic disadvantage - big assumption - you are correct.
- 3 - Good response to ROI - status quo not going to stop forever, but only as long as it meets our needs.
- 4 - Great pt. regarding we all owe assets to get to resources further south - cost-benefit argument is fantastic.

- 5 - "Sufficient" - Fine, but why not prepare for the future why not go above & beyond?
- 6 - Good way to stand by the fact that you did not say ~~you~~ you were going to throw money at limits, but rather by increasing education, social conditions etc. But... at the same time, is this not "significant presence"?

### Second Opposition

- 1 - Do you believe that CO2 is produced, or do you know? You should know. Debating 5 law are about fact - Not belief.
- 2 - ROI - You did not answer how we have the most water!!
- 3 - Is the ~~existing~~ existing station sufficient? Is it successful?
- 4 - I agree w/ you that we have other concerns to address -- this is a cost-benefit analysis and is highly convincing.
- 5 - Summary - I think you summarized very well - especially your closing line about how the status quo serves our current needs.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Celina Toia

No. of Judges: 3

Round: #4

Room: Physics Lab

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ~~YK-AT~~ BC-KT

Team Name: SK-TR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

~~Abdul Rehman~~  
Ben Turner

~~Geoffrey Taylor~~  
Zephi Kramer

Abdul-Rehman

Gul Raiz Tariq

Score
79
100

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

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

Bad transitions  
OK ↓

Team Score
160
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
161
200

you speak too quickly

7:35

→ good eye contact

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

watch out for major grammar mistakes

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

definition: house +  
→ climate change approach  
good road mapping  
good speaking style  
→ cultural disparity (Inuit) → suicide rates? NOT REALLY relevant  
→ 50% of potential in Arctic.  
→ how does this satisfy military interests?  
→ historical evidence → care to share? would it not create hostilities?

① Military

→ is it really over though?  
→ should patrol it... OK? ...

② Commercial activity

→ certifies recognition with regards to natural resources.  
→ deny climate change... so fixing environmental problems is being ho in the way?

Second Proposition

→ your opening was too long!  
→ where's your road map?  
→ see you referring or creating a pt?  
→ benefits of private sector.  
→ slip with the failure chippie stuff

①

→ too many stats not as compelling as you may think  
→ building infrastructure  
→ why are you talking about this?  
→ I DON'T KNOW!  
→ road map next time!  
→ no research to back up the fact 4 double pillars?

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

→ avoid opening → greedy perspective... blah, blah, blah.  
→ constructive matter in least min? NOT

Refutation

→ the status quo... huge amounts of \$  
→ we are doing perfectly fine... care to explain how?  
→ we can do other things → so vague!  
→ the use of the Northwest passage  
→ utilize our own resources → international  
→ global warming → this bill will destroy → increase debt.  
→ I don't think you know what exactly we have up there

Second Opposition

Refutation  
→ stop talking about Sask! why do we care so much about environmental damage... about cream u  
→ you did well by this

→ we have a lot of H<sub>2</sub>O you are right → bad P.O.I. on behalf of prop.  
→ all skills is the process  
① Programs  
② NASA → ok...?  
→ so the line is? ③ scientists → we should address other issues

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: David Price

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: Physics

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: BC KT

First Speaker:

Ben Turner

Second Speaker:

Zephi Kramer

Score
76
100

Score
83
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: SASK TR

First Speaker:

Abdul-Rehman

Second Speaker:

Gulraiz Tariq

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
159
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Watch linkage of points.  
(e.g. military ↔ Inuit suicide  
research ↔ commercial???)  
military ↔ no oil spills

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Make sure POI questions are clear  
Good attack on Inuit welfare point

Second Opposition

Make sure POI questions create  
an advantage and are in fact  
questions