

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: J Schurman

No. of Judges: _____

Round: 3

Room: M 343

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario 10 NM

Team Name: Alberta - ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kathryn Milochke Norman McElduff

Bryn Meekel Dylan Leman

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

Score
75
100

Score
72
100

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

Team Score
168
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
147
200

Right to

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

fully subsidized univer ed

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Did job
 Made points -
 more clarity needed
 re who gets in - no
 more students than
 currently
 Good rebuttal

Second Proposition

Great rebuttal

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Impressive facts at
 your fingertips

Second Opposition

Good presence but
 need more logical
 presentation.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Noel No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: M343

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kathlyn

Norman

Score
<u>86</u>
100

Score
<u>85</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryn

Dylan

Score
78
100

74

Score
75
100

73

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>147</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: Howard

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M343

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kathlyn Meloche

Norman Newellah

Score
86
100

Score
85
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryn Mechel

Dylan Leman

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score

171
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- great ~~pl~~ Very articulate speaker.
- 2 pts 2 work on:
 - a) ~~well done~~ strong arguments, but make sure to always link back to resolution
 - b) China & India → good to bring them up, but you might draw upon the example to illustrate that Canada needs to invest in education to remain competitive with these emerging economies.

Second Proposition

trend-setting ✓

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Why should education not be a right? (use principled arguments rather than citing UN Charter)

Second Opposition

Quality of education = good pt

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lyle Dobbin

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: MB - GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ariel Melamedoff

J.J. Gestein

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec - LS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Janna Shapiro

Eric Laurin

Score
83
100

Score
76 76
100

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

Team Score
160
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
159 159
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Very confident style, quite compelling
- Be careful not to make assertions, particularly in rights analysis. Use analogies
- Great summary, connect to point about society gap fell to your side. Prove it!

Second Proposition

- Best style in the round IMO.
- Interesting economics argument, might be more beneficial to talk about living standards rather than creating it

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great quality of edu point, good logic
- also be careful assertion rights are about survival. they might be, prove it to me!
- solid rebuttal

Second Opposition

- Hard to argue that going to uni doesn't give you an advantage in society, good effort
- Relax, take your time.
- Ask "why" over and over in prep, if you know the answers you'll be more confident in your argument

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Josh Judil

No. of Judges: 02

Round: 03

Room: 321

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Mb - GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ariel Melamaleth

JJ Gerstein

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec LS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Janna Shupina

Eric Lawin

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>75</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>158</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

This H3T Students are entitled to fully subsidized education
 Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MUHAMMAD SALIM No. of Judges: (3) Round: 3 Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GM

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Ariel Melamedoff JJ Gersten

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec LS

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Sanna Shapiro Eric Laurin

Score
82
100

Score
76.77
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
158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Winner
 Style OK: good

Judge's Comments:
 First Proposition

Def. Public funded university
Less out his cent Edu. Necessity
Intellect based: High school Nice limit
Partially essential
Govt Responsibility
Quality of Life Potential
emphysis
Right's Analysis
partial Point

POI G
 1 1 1
 POI T
 1 1

Judge's Comments:
 First Opposition

Case analysis
const 1 Quality of Ed
Govt not able to provide quality
good analysis
2 What is right
defined as right, well
Class. Ownership
1 B.F.S.T. ownership
2 Society (Sweden) Not USA?
3 Govt Role

POI G
 1 1 1
 POI T
 1 1 1
 POI G
 1 1 1

Second Proposition

Quality
more educated
Society
Class -> Right
Rebuttal
less blue collar workers
Not good
Rebuttal (mediocre)
const
inv for future
fund for students
Sweden - good
example

Speech (good)
 POI G
 1 1 1
 POI T
 1 1

Second Opposition

Analysis
Class. Not good
Rebuttal Not
well
const
1 und ed
not necessary
2 Division

POI G
 1 1 1
 POI T
 1 1 1

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Muir

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 1329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC - AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeline Armstrong

Sorani Rai

Score
80
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nic Martin

Thomas Lamothe

Score
87
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score
160
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
167
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Well spoken, good organization
Try to be more clear in your
def. in future.
Try to substantiate your
arguments more.
-keep asking "why" & "How"

Second Proposition

Good substance
try to organize your
rebuttal in a more systematic
way.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great analysis in rebuttal!
strong constructive.
Try to avoid extraneous
costs like drinking water in
a resolution such as this

Second Opposition

Good organization
try to back up key arguments
with

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Patrick Peotto

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeleine Armstrong

Sonam Rai

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nic Martin

Thomas Lamothe

Score
87
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

167
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- well outlined organized
- strong POIs
- need more logical support & connections
- could have done better job in response to POI

Second Proposition

- strong analysis @ times
- some creative arguments
- need to organize clash more effectively
-

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- very well structured
- strong POIs
- little too fast @ times - prioritize

Second Opposition

- well organized
- nice summation
- good pace
- need to make logical links
- need to reply to POI in better manner

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katherine Fu

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: H329

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia - AR

Team Name: Manitoba ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeleine Armstrong

Souam Rai

Dic Narmen

Thomas Lamotte

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

Score
86
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

166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- very nice organization
- added clarity in the model would lead to a clearer round - clearly set out the current structure before replacing changes.

Second Proposition

- very effective content
- more organization and clearer links would have made your points more relevant

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- every effective refutation
- more time spent on content would have strengthened case

Second Opposition

- avoid making generalizations without linking everything back to the resolution, a few points were almost irrelevant.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Clarke

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M339

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NWT - HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Greg Hanna

Emily Smith

Score
82 82
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask - ZK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelly Zheng

Rainer Kocsis

Score
80
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score

161
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- 1st Prop made the point (fairness) on which there was most clash, and won the point overall
- economics point was weaker → supported government spending in general, not clearly tied to road

Second Proposition

great job

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- "not practical" point didn't really talk about how it wasn't practical
- 2nd speaker shifted case in some ways → communicate beforehand!
- 1st speaker supports needs-based funding, 2nd thinks freemarket = freer people

Second Opposition

overall guys!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BERTOIA

No. of Judges:

Round: 1

Room: 339

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NWT-HS

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SASK-2K

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

GREG HANNA

EMILY SMITH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelly Zheng

RAINIER KOCSIS

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>75</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>154</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: TIM BONNAR No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: M339
Senior

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NWT HS

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Greg Hanna Emily Smith

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SASK ZK

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Kelly Zheng Rainer Kocis

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score

161
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

155
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- smooth, confident delivery
- ably answers P.O.I.s - but should not take so many - just 2 is okay
- some more time on need would strengthen your case
- offer P.O.I.s - at least 2 of each speaker
- be careful with tone - at times (especially the reply speech) the sarcasm and tone seem arrogant. Aim for earnest, not derisive
- reply speech - focus on the keys - don't cover everything

Second Proposition

- good opening clash
- explanation of right to ed is good
- global competitiveness is a good argument
- knocking the efficacy of Canadian high school is not - you can praise our current system while also recognizing the need for more people to have higher ed.
- work on ~~more~~ including more energy in your delivery.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- well structured - clearly laid out
- needs a more energetic style
- take 2 P.O.I.s, not just one
- some good arguments about maintaining status quo and the need for different types of education. Be careful not to denigrate choices such as fine arts or liberal arts as you did.

Second Opposition

- needs to rise on P.O.I.s
- making it a debate about communist dystopia vs. capitalist free market is a very big reach. Canada is a democratic socialist country - it is possible to have equality without communism
- well spoken - engaging
- monitor your time - give yourself time for all of constructive

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Rhonda Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M130

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ont UL

Team Name: NS DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denizhan Uykur Valentin Litvin

Alyson Duff Blair MacNeil

Score
84
100

Score
81
100

Score
78
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

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Denizhan

Strong Points -> Financial point did become an issue -> Wanted you to deal with it a bit more, but other points were well-developed.

- >
- Don't be afraid to slow down a bit.
- Strong speaker.

Second Proposition

Valentin

- Good debating style.
- Go into analysis of your arguments a bit more, but great job of rebuilding partner's points.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Alyson

Main point of quality vs. quantity - Good point as you cornered them on the financial pt. It is a big issue.

- Stumbled on the POI's -> But good attempt & you demonstrated a presence.

Second Opposition

Blair

- Incentives a good point.
- Strong Delivery & Strong reputation.
- Very good support for your partner, but wanted both of you going into quality vs quantity / argument sooner, as both of you stressed this as a main point.

Inter

Good debate on both sides quality vs quantity / argument sooner, as both of you stressed this as a main point.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Geoff Buerger

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M130

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO UL

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

DENIZHAN UYKUR

VALENTIN LITVIN

ALYSON DUFF

BLAIR MACNEIL

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

WHAT HAPPENED TO COLLEGE + APPRENTICESHIP? YOU PUT THEM ON THE TABLE, THEN IGNORED THEM.

IN REBUTTAL, GOOD RESPONSE TO STRATIFICATION OF SOCIETY, POOR RESPONSE TO HANUARD (where those who can pay, do, no 1st opp suggested = constructive)

Second Proposition

HOW DO MORE SELECTIVE UNIVERSITIES MAKE HIGH SCHOOLS MORE EFFICIENT? YOU MADE THAT POINT, BUT I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND IT.

IT WAS HUBRISTIC - AND ERRONEOUS - FOR YOU TO SUGGEST THAT "EVERYONE HAS A SIMILAR QUALITY OF LIFE ANALYSIS"

A VERY TIGHT CASE, IN WHICH AFFIRMATIVE ARGUED FOR A SUBSIDIZED MERITOCRACY RATHER THAN UNIVERSAL ACCESS - WHILE CLAIMING THE NATIONAL BENEFITS OF UNIVERSAL ACCESS.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

IT WOULD HAVE BEEN BETTER TO PROVIDE THE RIGHTS ANALYSIS IN CONSTRUCTIVE RATHER THAN REBUTTAL.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION (OTTAWA, NS SCHOOLS) WAS A WELCOME ADDITION - BUT NOT INTRODUCED UNTIL REBUTTAL. EARLIER, S.V.R.

Second Opposition

ARE THERE LARGER ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED, BEYOND PROJECTED CLASS SIZE + THE STRESS EXPERIENCED BY DEMOS? (OVERALL GOV'T SPENDING CUTS? DELETERIOUS TAXATION?)

MOST IMPORTANT, YOU SHOULD HAVE ATTACKED THE AFFIRMATIVE ON THE MISSING ELEMENTS OF THE CASE.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: NATALYA SLEPNEVA

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M130

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO ~~UL~~

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

DENIZHAN UYKUR VALENTIN LITVIN

ALYSON DUFF BLAIR MACNEIL

Score
84
100

Score
81
100

Score
80
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
159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Individual comments given in round

RFD: gov't made good arguments for the need for a university education, the way the government currently fails students, especially lower-income students, and the way in which more university education will attract more funding to the country.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Opposition focused too much on the issue of larger class sizes and didn't tackle some of the more principled matter on proposition, or the argument about foreign direct investment. Might have been beneficial for opp to focus more on subsidizing education for higher-income students, and on the incentives created

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Evan Weiser

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M311

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC KT

Team Name: Newfoundland UN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ben Turner

Zephi Kramer

Morgan Walsh

Kate McVeil

Score
73
100

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Score
72
100

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

Team Score
148
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
146
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- to need to be more structured, the best organized team tends to win in H.S. Debates
- Need to go more
- Good PMR, liked writing and example

Second Proposition

- Good Refutation
- Need a point, student leader was brought up way too late

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- In general it would have been nice to have better points/more focused overall
- Missed some opportunities to question why education is a right
- Good refutation

Second Opposition

- Your point was very similar to 1st opp, ~~in general~~
- At the end you mentioned ed being compromised b/c of this measure / having less research => that was good, it should have been your point

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Catherine Holloway

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 11319 Room: 3

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia KT

Team Name: Newfoundland WN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ben Turner Zephi Kramer

Morgan Walsh Kate McNeil

Score
74
100

Score
74 7
100

Score
75
100

Score
72
100

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

Team Score
151
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
147
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Organizational problems and fuzzy definition got us off to a bit of bad start
 Creative intro and some good ideas

Second Proposition

Very good refutation but constructive points didn't come across clearly

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good organization
 Points didn't quite hit the key issues or acknowledge the PROP notion of merit

Second Opposition

Your main constructive point really overlapped ~~of~~ your partner's second point

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Stephen McCarthy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M319

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC KT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ben Turner

Zephi Kramer

Score
73
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NFL WN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Morgan Walsh

Kate McNeil

Score
74
100

Score
72
100

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

Team Score

149
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

146
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- improve organization
- decent PMR
- focus on the core issues: why a right to Uni. educ?

Second Proposition

- good rebuttal
- more focus on constructive goal?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- points somewhat off-focus → Opp focused on individuals, perhaps better approach at societal/systemic level?

Second Opposition

- point similar to partner's 2nd point
- ensure you meet the Prop's model

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: RYAN ROGERS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta-RL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joeh Rowledge

Jedson Lamb

Score
<u>86</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec-CM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Marcovitch

Melissa Cape

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>169</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>157</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Excellent speakers
- Solid constructive all around

Comments
given in round

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: DAVID BLAWIL

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: AB-RL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joer Rowledge

Jasal Lamb

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Q - CM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Marcovitel

Melissa Cape

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score
168
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Comments given 12

12

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kathleen Butler

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 326

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta RL

Team Name: Quebec CM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joel Rowledge Jason Lamb

David Marcovitch Melissa Cape

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score	<table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><td>168</td></tr> <tr><td>200</td></tr> </table>	168	200
168			
200			

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score	<table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><td>156</td></tr> <tr><td>200</td></tr> </table>	156	200
156			
200			

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Comments given during round!

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jake Roth

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: QLTD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dan Ton - That

Jeremy Obrand

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SaskSM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Areeb Salim

Nasra Maumin

Score
76
100

Score
78 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

- spend less time introducing your material.
- Most of your speech revolved around a changing job market. As such, it lacked adequate argumentation.
- very engaging speaking style
- ~~A summary speech~~
- really good summary speech
- Why is mentonary good? Why should we care about socio-economic inequality?

Second Proposition

- If you are going to talk about rights, you need to tell me more than you need a degree to get jobs.
- re: university is an extension of the education system
 - ↳ why? why ~~should~~ should that be the case?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- "It's a capitalist society" is not an argument. You must, rather, justify capitalism's underlying principles to make a strong argument.
- The taxpayers argument kind of circles around the motion.
- A summary speech should tell me why your side won. ~~you are not convincing, you are not convincing~~

Second Opposition

- Difficult to follow at times
- Some good responses to POI and a ~~good~~ ^{decent} ~~strong~~ ^{strong} POI offered (re: dropping out of school at 16)
- This speech did not have much new analysis, so it didn't move the round ~~far~~ forward, as it should have.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: SARAH

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec TO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dan Ton-That

Jeremy Obbard

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sasnakhewan SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Areeb Salim

Nasra Moumin

Score
78
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

150
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Great speaking style.

Tacit idea of right better. I think your case hinged too much on education is a right because people need it to survive. But they don't.

Second Proposition

Great speaking style.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good speech. Smart POs.

Focus more on principle of right rather than infrastructure.

Second Opposition

Smart intro.

The idea that students are adults needed to be said.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Cori Kusel No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Qc TO

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Dan Ton - That Jeremy O'Rand

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask. SM

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

A. Salim

N. Maumin

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
154
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Case - ^{How will} you subsidize?
 • Students protesting right now are not asking for full subsidization
 • Does a degree get you a job? A problem that we have over-qualified people
 • Good eye contact but get more emotional/passionate about what you are talking about. • other reasons for law marks in high school - maturity - family issues

Second Proposition

Great eye contact / emotion / gestures -
 Work on organizing / transitions - 2 good POI's
 You need stronger arguments, ex. → ^{path} life decided at 16? 17? → expand Educ. as a right
 Why we should value education in Canada.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

slow down
 work on organization / transition linking points together
 - I feel like you put society in 2 categories service & university grads - what about all of the others?
 • How decide merit?
 • what about loans? / not just scholarships.

Second Opposition

- Try to have different points from your partner. 1st pt. was the same.
 - Too colloquial - "We don't think"
 "Um" "Um"
 • Be careful - We propose.
 what about international students who speak different languages do they really bring down the.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Simon C

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS-OB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SK-WX ~~Jason Xi-~~

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

Score
71
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
144
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Would have liked to hear analysts about democracy

Second Proposition

Great material

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Refute!

Second Opposition

o

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Holly Kallmeyer

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3 Room: M342

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia - OB

Team Name: Saskatchewan - WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Debi Gynrinda

Oliver Bjornsson

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

Score
71
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
144
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Excellent job!
- Framed round well - principled stance
- Exposed weaknesses to status quo
- Responded well to opp's points of education inflation and meritocracy

Second Proposition

- Great analysis!
- Good rebuttal

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good job!
- Meritocracy point would have had more value if it were clearer
↳ perhaps outline why subsidization wouldn't increase meritocracy insofar as there are income related parts ~~one~~ of one's performance in high school
- Good framing in rebuttal (last speech)
- Not enough rebuttal in 1st speech

Second Opposition

- Good job!
- Good POIs
- Unsustainability point was defeated as soon as Debi said other countries do this sustainably

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: William Onyegi

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M-342

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS-~~OB~~OB

Team Name: SK-WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Debi Ogunde

Oliver Bjornsen

Jason Xiao

Chris Wadd

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

Score
71
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	144
	200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

→ ~~through~~ ~~then~~ Cleanly explained principles

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

→ Should've spent more time on refutation

Second Proposition

→ Very concise and indepth

Second Opposition

→ Keepers constructive should score first

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Louise Chalmer

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: L310

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec KM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Michelin

Emma Katz

Score
73
100

Score
70
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba MB FT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jaclyn Flon

Ella Thomson

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

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

Team Score

143
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

limited understanding of economics
is anything free?
establish a line of argumentation

affect the future of Canada?
why? will the economy be stable
if everyone who wants to go
to university, does?
muddled logic - confusion -
NOT responsive to arguments put forward
by Opposition

Rebuttal ~~is~~ needs more substance

You must deal with the concept
of a "right".

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

responds well to PROP's arguments
good clash

STABILITY argument well developed
limited understanding of tax system

- decreased #s?
right to educ.
- create instability?
- value of subsidy
to taxpayer

STRONG summary
questions

Second Opposition

- good refutation of prop's argument
- strong organization.

How do university educated people contribute
to society? Are they a value?
Good use of time.

→ It is NOT a McGill protest. In fact, McGill is not involved.
UQAM, U of M, cegeps + some high schools. Some faculties at Concord
are involved

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JAMES PHELAN No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: 310

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: QUEBEC - KM

Team Name: MANITOBA - FT

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

First Speaker: Second Speaker:

Emily Michelin Emma Katz

Saclyn Flom Ella Thomson

Score
73
100

Score
74
100

Score
78
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score	147
	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

Comments given orally.

Comments given orally.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Reena Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: F310

PROPOSITION

Team Name: KM Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Michelin

emma katz

Score
73
100

Score
71
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: FT- Manitoba

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jaclyn Flom

Ella Thomson

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

144
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

155
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

good roadmap
need to have better fleshed out the arguments

* not mcgill protests

Second Proposition

Weak arguments

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

nice roadmap
example wasn't good

Second Opposition

nice refute and rebuilding

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aaron Schachner

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: L336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: A Alberta SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim Kat Sniukhanski

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia LF

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelsey Reddy Jeric Pantig

Score
77
100

Score
82
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

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition *nic speaking style
Resolution needed more definition.*

Second Proposition *Interesting P.O. J.S
Arguments needed to be clearer.*

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition *nic speaking style - need more
clash.*

Second Opposition *Interesting argument about
benefits of manual labor at McDonald's
Didn't really address prop's arguments
about admission standards*

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Amur

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: L 336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: AB SK

First Speaker:

Andrew

Second Speaker:

Kat

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS KP

First Speaker:

Nelsey

Second Speaker:

Sevic

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Score
<u>84</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>166</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: GIE BRICKER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: L336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberto SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim

Kat SIKHUMSIN

Score
81
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA KP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelsey Kelley

JEFF PAUL

Score
80
100

Score
79
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

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alan Grand

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3 Room: M135

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sask FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Avron Fritzler

Adam Hamilton

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>73</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zavad Hassan

Francesca Faregnoli

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>76</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>153</u>
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

*Good establishment,
good presentation
some strange logic:
(middle-class drinking ->
social standing?)
Handled very well.*

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

*Good establishment.
Draws economy? How?
proof, examples.
Didn't develop, poor assertions.*

Second Opposition

Strong presentation

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julia Wagner

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M133

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan FH

Team Name: Quebec FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aaron Fitzer

Arthur Hamilton

Zawad Hassan

Francesca Farginoli

Score
81
100

Score
75
100

Score
77 77
100

Score
76 76
100

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

Team Score
156
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
153
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Very good style/delivery/
structure

Model needed a bit more
definition (i.e. don't need a
university degree for a trade job...)

VERY strong rebuttal but point about
funding education won't indicate lower
jobs / not up to govt to say who will
be plumbers needed to be
made earlier!

Second Proposition

Wasn't sold on constructive
argument

Good POI response about
family \$ wasn't made by
students

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Really wasn't sold on "if you
make education available won't have
lower paying jobs so societal
imbalance"

Good distinction on difference
~~between~~ between 1^o/2^o and
university education ~~is~~ in terms
of basic rights

Second Opposition

Very strong delivery!

Why weren't things like
loans/ bursaries addressed
in terms of alternate
ways to fund education?

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: J. Burg

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 133

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aaron Fritzler

Arthur Hamilton

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zawad Hassan

Francesca Fargnoli

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>74</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>150</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- particularly good analysis of the rhetorical aspects, but in need of further support of actual examples.

Second Proposition

- good job bringing debate back to definition of "qualification" which really helped. Electing a Hitler seemed extreme.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good case construction, but limited refutation. Watch time management. One POI re: wealth did not work in your favour.

Second Opposition

generally good analysis in refutation, but tended to be very broad. Specific examples much needed for support. Please try to get into the P.O.I. aspect of the game.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Celina

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M234

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario AW

Team Name: Manitoba PT

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Connor Ahluwalia

Nate Winsor

Adrienne Tessier

Ryan Pistorius

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Score
77
100

Score
82
100

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

7:37 *good*

→ Good speaking style

→ Good road mapping

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

house = ONTARIO
 ↳ too narrow makes no sense & lightens your burden
 ↳ don't list professional jobs (PhDs)
 ↳ public education system. (superficial analysis)
 ↳ not allowing ppl? → last time I checked I am currently allowed to go.
 ↳ economic elite only the are able to afford (rich in US. poor)
 ↳ stratification. rich are the leaders it is the sad reality
 ↳ we need more incentives. Good!
 ↳ good attack on contradictions!

Second Proposition
 ↳ we need more incentives. Good!
 ↳ good attack on contradictions!

Refutation
 ↳ 3000\$ → bare minimum process
 ↳ should discuss the of income taxes to clash taxes P.O.I.
 ↳ good attack on bare minimum... no progress
 ↳ adjustment to inflation not apt for your side.

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
160
200

Team Score
159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

cur opening but I don't think it is accurate.
 ↳ what about the effect on taxes? ↳ Good road mapping
 ↳ 3000\$ a year. OK.
 ↳ where will money come from health care cost? ↳ why this precisely? ↳ not best failure. ↳ not at all true!
 ↳ Idea of a "Right" * → each what?
 ↳ govt + ~~not~~ not responsible? ↳ for part - secondary education ↳ very controversial pt

Second Opposition
 ↳ true they did define it poorly! ↳ they will get penalized for that.
 ↳ Retribution
 ↳ I don't care about your personal situation
 ↳ why is your constructive matter in productive form!
 ↳ 100 wrong with it!

Refutation
 ↳ not true! why talk about McGill!
 ↳ competition for Ontario schools
 ↳ true will result in a lack of incentive for other provinces
 ↳ academic standards ↳ influence of students → how can you afford it? ↳ taxation ↳ GOOD ATTACK!
 ↳ incentives = good ↳ stronger economy ↳ more qualified
 ↳ Govt influence ↳ academic freedom ↳ not streamlined by govt +

good
 ↳ POI's on public education are good but you don't hit the point here PT is this is ok your POI's are

8:18

↳ true! thank what you pay in debt & it lowest in all of Canada.

↳ DISAGREE! ↳ that will happen

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Brent Schmitt

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

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario AW

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Connor Ahluwalia Mate Wisor

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba PT

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Adriane Tessier Ryan Pistorius

Score
77
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score
161
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:
First Proposition**

Good PM, good definition
needed more analysis / less flowery
language

Excellent PMR

Second Proposition

good refutation
point somewhat irrelevant (constructive)
needed more rebuilding

**Judge's Comments:
First Opposition**

too much model kicking,
needed to present more
refutation and spend more
time fleshing out points

Second Opposition

best speech, but was too focused on
rhetoric,
needed more refutation

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Will Hiscock

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M234

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario AW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Connor Ahlowalia Nate Winsor

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba PT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Adrienne Tessier Ryan Pistorius

Score
78
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score
161
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
160
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Attaining 1st degree in Ontario
- ① Investment in Future
- ② Levels the Playing Field

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Melissa D'Angio

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: M137

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: OM KK

Team Name: Manitoba Hkf

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Tae-Hu Kim Anson Kwok

Anthony Hightman Michael Honke

Score
<u>87</u>
100

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>76</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>151</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- well defined
- well structured - good mapping
- Social contract
- Human rights
- Workforce - degree of specialization
- emerging adulthood → excellent point!
- * Poole - will deal with
- opportunity - cyclical - good!
- integration
- * all points very well explained - detailed - good!

Second Proposition

- health should not define education
- ↳ well stated
- ↳ solid rebuttal
- University debt - good point.
- Public vs. Private schooling
- Subsidies working well thus far, why not continue it? - Good!
- Strong reconstruction

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Rebuttal - points well explained
- good example of changes in Aboriginal grad increase (60%)
- Poole will deal with (complete your thought before accepting.)
- Good use of examples to support your points
- Mapping would help organize your delivery.
- good 3 point build down

Second Opposition

- well introduced
- Right vs. responsibility → good
- Summer job - finances - good example
- Streamlining
- France - example, good
- * well explained
- ↳ complete your thought before accepting your Poole.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Emma O'Rourke-Jiel

No. of Judges: 3

Round: _____

Room: M137

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ON KK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tae-Hu Kim

Anson Kwok

Score
87
100

Score
84
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba HTW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anthony Wightman

Michael Henke

Score
73
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

171
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

148
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Laid out a clear & interesting case. excellent points analysis. perhaps shifting some of the constructive matter to the 1st speech would allow it to be better developed.

Second Proposition

Had a good job engaging with the strongest version of the opp case. Work on reconstructing the PM's material in a new/different way → will give your speech more impact.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Several instances conceding that education is a right → this is bad! perhaps would have been useful to look at societies where education is not a right, or is not as highly subsidized. Ultimately this debate was about rights & principles and cost arguments were not sufficient to win.

Second Opposition

The use of frame was good, but should have come out earlier in the round so others could engage. While can examples are good, make sure you extract principles from the case in order to make the strongest case possible.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: William Gibson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M137

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ON KK

First Speaker:

Tae-Hu Kim

Second Speaker:

Anson Kwok

Score
87
100

Score
84
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - HW

First Speaker:

Anthony Wightman

Second Speaker:

Michael Honke

Score
73
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
171
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
148
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Social contract was good, relevant, could have been made deeper and the connections to education clearer
- Great PMR & setting up of debate.
- Might have made debate clearer to set it somewhere, but a principled case is still totally okay.

Second Proposition

- Some of structure was somewhat messy, especially reconstruction. Make sure to roadmap clearly.
- Good German example, make sure to back up assertions.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Great structure!
- There was a recognition of many important conceptual problems in the resolution, but a refusal to engage with Government's principled arguments left opposition with little ground to stand on.
- First constructive was great, #2,3 could have been made clearer & deeper.

Second Opposition

- Also, take less pols!
- Don't let Gov dominate!
- Interesting case study, remember to make every part of it relevant to the broader issues of the round. Be clear: don't make us do work for you!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Chalk

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 1

Room: M230

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Regina Huda School - Saskatchewan
-TR

Team Name: Riverview HS - Nova Scotia
-NR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Gulraiz Tariq Abdul-Rehman

Bhreegh Ross

Ryan Newring

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

152
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

154
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Comments given orally

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M.K. Jackson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 232

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-OY

Team Name: MB-HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sherwin Yousef-Zadhi Yesha Ouyang

Daniel Huang Allen Liu

Score
82
100

Score
81
100

Score
79
100

Score
80
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

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Debra Miko

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: m232

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-OY

Team Name: MB-HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Shervin Youzaduki Yesha Ouyang

Daniel Huang

Allen Liu

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score

159
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

154
200

(PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION)

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

well done.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isabelle Fahmy No. of Judges: 3 Round: 1 Room: M232

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC - OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Shervin Yousef
Zadeh

Yesha Ouyang

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>78</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MB - HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daniel Huang

Allan Liu

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>79</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>154</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: Loirelie DeRoose

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M325

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Leo Plumber

Christop Pike

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec BR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

sarah Bhatt

Sabrina Roy

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

149
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

needs more refutation
esp in rebuttal
allowed opp to hijack pt re
"blind need"
- need to clarify and
take back point
- need to show more belief
in own case.

Second Proposition

missed key rebuttal points.
let private vs. public
even @ HS. pt.
go.
allowed assumptions to go on.
challenge - if rich don't
have to sacrifice - then why
do you think they will do well -
no incentives

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

made lots of assumptions,
but lucky left unchallenged
by prop.

Second Opposition

3) argument unclear.
Need to address
prop pts with more
compassion -
"cater to poor"

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Romeo No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: M325

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

First Speaker:

Cec Plummer

Second Speaker:

Christoph Pike

Score
74
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec OP

First Speaker:

Sarah Ballit

Second Speaker:

Sabrina Roy

Score
79
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score
149
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Do much more
Direct refutation!

Second Proposition

Make sure you respond directly to points made in the previous speech. Your role is 50% refutation.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Fairly strong speech. Attempt more depth in analysis.

Everyone give more points

Second Opposition

Make it more clear exactly why scholarships already solve many problems.



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: A. Langlois

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M325

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

Team Name: Quebec BR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Leo Plumer

Christoph Pike

Sarah Pattat

Sabrina Roy

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score

152
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

154
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

be careful with overstatement
(people need to go to university
to get jobs - if not they get
into drugs)

be more confident with your
position

Second Proposition

you forgot to rebuild your partner's
case

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

be careful with time management
not try at clashing

Second Opposition

your point was not relevant with
this case

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ANDREW KAPLAN

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M 334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia TD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Denhoff

Christian Taylor

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tarong Marathe

Alastair Smith

Score
80
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score

165
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Fair definition. Some worthy points but needed to include some more meaty arguments to prop up your case. Limited speed fair point but again, needed to fleshed out in another way rather than parallel examples. Need to ask more concise POI's

Second Proposition

Strong refocusing of case. direct clash with size app. Points do well to reinforce central claims [equality versus class]. Be careful when referring to "underclass" and ~~delegating~~ role or education of electricians & plumbers.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Need to manage your time better. Watch the way you phrase your argument [make it sound more attractive & less inflammatory]. Strong speaking style. Lots of clash.

Second Opposition

Can't use some more organization
↳ eg) a platform / signposting. Need to respond directly to POI's rather than circle around it. Strong refutation once you get past your first point.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: VIRGINIA ROBERTSON

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia TID

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Derhoff

Christian Taylor

Score
80
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tarang Marathe

Alastair Smith

Score
82
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score
161
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
164
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

David - definition subsidized = free
 - best vs. richest (access to educ.)
 - eg. British Army (8th)
 - army vs. students (??) "best"
 - gov't intervention to make sure "best"
 - nobility + rich access = corruption set educ.
 - Ancient Greeks = ?? not open ??
 - can univ. students not pay the bill \$
 - history → answered the best have access to educ. at the end of the road

Christian
 econ. growth = higher levels of education.
 Why educ. is the key to economic growth?
 Basic blue collars needed = question if actually exist
 Accountability = scholarship students do well.
 Gov't pay = "brainwashing" in univ.
 Constructive pt. = countries that invested in
 Higher educ. = econ. growth. (Korea, China, India)
 (should gov't elected people have higher educ.)
 → one they better in gov't.
 - more competition for educated jobs = better workers

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

TARANG
 Q. est. → Bursars / scholarships? for all?
 - Agree with decline of elitism = false ideal
 - need of "blue collar workers" → skippitized workers etc. fish
 - not arguing the "right" to a fully subsidized
 - cost of educ. ... imp. = make educ. student ^{feel} accountability for learning
 ↳ promotes capitalism
 - assumes knowledge of student mindset
 - Role of gov't → not duty to achieve highest level of educ. ... gov't
 - dependency on gov't. to provide everything = minimum
 - univ. dependent on gov't → ^{control} ^{influence} pernicious
Alastair
 Distribution of costs?? → money isn't only reason for educ.
 ↳ barriers to educ. is not only \$\$.
 - social tension arises from being concerned with tax \$\$ earned go to others.
 - Cycles of poverty → disadvantaged have to pay.
 - univ. educ. is not made for educ. through taxes.
 - enriched what Tarang said → re-iterated views
 - incentives vs. effort in educ.
 - Role of gov't in educ.

- Great arguers
- Great ref both teams

Very very impressed with this round!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Cal

RFD: Alistar makes brilliant point about non-tuition barriers that was refuted by other teams. Not refuted.
- Every try else in RD. was basically well

No. of Judges: 3

Round: _____

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia TD

Team Name: Ontario SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Denhoff

Christian Taylor

Tarang Marathe

Alistar Smith

Score
84
100

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

Score
85
100

Comments in round will be clearer sorry!

David: You crushed "slow off" point in reply but you need to go for best point. (Best point) their better ones were Re: Best in university = more tax revenue!

Team Score
164
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
167
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

Best not richest in university: - Better value for education. - Best brightest = best use - Military example. - Ancient Greece - Public schools example... - Men. - Give those great care arguments! - Tense and concisely. How get better students? - I know you know!

Good POT: 4-6 yrs! Excellent response! - Not charity but for scholarships. Good angle! Cutoff...! Another great POT response! Recession was we need invest!

Second Proposition

Lower class more educated - Push up. - mechanism? (Plates get paid more!) - go for McGill - underclass - masters degree response maybe not best. - Good examples. - Invested in Canada. (Spillovers?) - Shortage of technicians IT? - Democracy stronger, people pick better gov'ts. - ↑ competition for Gov't jobs - Best brightest! - In court not better votes (Atheistic: Rich or Poor?)

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- Good POT Re: Scholarships - Makes it seem like you must go to university - Need "lower class of workers" need. ble collar. - Why are they any more stigmatized if its free? - Keep an eye on props framework and how this argument sounds within it! - Now best + brightest not smartest. - Great POT on Master's degree - Present? - See ideas too many

Second Opposition

- Woun! Great intro - no more people educated - But that wasn't their whole argument! - Great SPL - off costs for poor - still you middle class go in cuz can afford - exasperates cycle of poverty! - No HS education. - Amazing! - University education in set + chain not good - way? (Public vs Private?) - sense out your knowledge of Public vs. Private Dichotomy! - stigmatize as stupid

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lauren Shadley

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: M336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia EL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Terry Lee

Amina Egeh

Score
76
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia OS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Will Dawson

Rebecca Sutton

Score
78
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score

156
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Comments given in round.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kiara Kaminski

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M341

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia MS

Team Name: Alberta HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julia Mirden

Zack Santella

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Score
80
100

Score
75
100

Score
70
100

Score
73
100

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

Team
Score

155
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

143
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aden Kovacs-Litan

No. of Judges: _____

Round: _____

Room: _____

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC N.S

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julia Milder

Zack Suttell

Score
80
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Score
73
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score

155
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

146
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Penner

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M341

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC MS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julian Molden

Zack Sandella

Score
80
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Score
73
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score
155
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
146
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Oral feedback.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: AMIR KHOUZAM

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: BM340

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kirsten Schmandor

Helen Beaumont

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec GR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Megan Gagliano

Karen Butt

Score
81
100

Score
77
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

Good model explanation
 - Try to roadmap your speech in the beginning, to help the judges follow
 - Should have defined a right as a concept - key term in the resolution.

Second Proposition

- Good response to POI's
 - good rebuttal
 - make sure you relate all points brought up by opposition.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good rebuttal
 - good definition of both right and privilege, highlighted lack of proposition definition
 - Slow down, articulation,

Second Opposition

Good highlighting of contradictions in Side Gov's case
 - slide to the structure of your speech, and slow down to fill your time. Good rebuttal of Opp case.
 - Try not to be repetitive.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Cam Climie (chair) No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: 340

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kirsten Solmundson Helen Beaumont

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec - GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Megan Gagliano Karen Butt

Score
81
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

151
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Public v. private is problematic model
- Rights analysis (why should it be a right) needs to be stronger + earlier
- better signposting of points.
- Too much focus on somewhat untrue assertions about uni.

Second Proposition

- seemed to be a lot of IG repetition.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- response to "nicer society" point was confusing
- good analysis of "privilege v. rights"

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jeffinsky

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: M340

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba SB

Team Name: Quebec GB

First Speaker:

~~Kirsten Solmonson~~
~~Megan Guglielmo~~

Second Speaker:

~~Helen Beaumont~~
~~Karen Butt~~

First Speaker:

~~Megan Guglielmo~~
~~Kirsten Solmonson~~

Second Speaker:

~~Karen Butt~~
~~Helen Beaumont~~

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

Score
81
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

151
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Decent defⁿ, stumbled out of the block and and only partially defined res. (7:46)
- Not strong enough supporting arguments, as evidenced by # of P.O.'s accepted and rejected
- 2nd point was unfounded and hearsay.
- Solid conclusion
- > Rebuttal: Good job in attaching their points to solidify their own. Too long! (7:15)

Second Proposition

- Shaky from the start and going around in circles
- Spent half the time refuting, but supported partner well. (8:10)
- Developed more solid arguments as the speech progressed.
- Very good conclusion.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Very strong start with a good refutation.
- Confident style, animated and enthusiastic (8:17)
- Good 1st argument
- 2nd point went around in circles at first, but was left somewhat unresolved at the end.
- TIME limit! Tried to cram too much at the end.
- > Rebuttal: Very strong. Refuted prop points well and solidified their own. Time limit! (7:15)

Second Opposition

- Sound logic on first point, then rambled for most of it. (7:41)
- Points seem to lose focus as the speech progresses.
- Feels only half refuted.
- Confidence faded towards the end.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Robinson No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: L

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec HZ Team Name: Nova Scotia FB

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

First Speaker: _____ Second Speaker: _____

Andrew Hamilton

Victor Zhao

Aislin Flynn

Clarissa Brisseau

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Score
81
100

Score
81 81
100

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

Team Score
156
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Good delivery
- Clear case
- > Offer more POI's
- > Point about wealthy was not as clear as it should have been.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Well organized
- Good POI's
- Watch the time
- ~~Good~~ Could have been more energetic at times
- Good rebuttal speech

Second Proposition

- Offer more POI's
- Good delivery
- Good arguments but could be organized more effectively
- Some good attacks but could have done more.
 - ↳ greater analysis → explain why they are wrong in more detail

Second Opposition

- Try to ~~have~~ offer more POI's
- Good delivery
- Good arguments and counter arguments
- ↳ Good introduction
- ↳ Well organized
- ↳ Could have added more constructive points, but very good rebuilding.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Patricia Johnson-Castle

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: 1304

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Québec HZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Hamilton Victor Zhao

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS-FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aislin Flynn

Clarissa Brisseau

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score

153
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

165
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Need to ask questions like:
 who will this effect?
 is this the best solution?
 etc

Second Proposition

good ideas, organize better

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Better analysis, focus on more on principles

Second Opposition

great refutation
 constructive

A L W A Y S
 A S K W H Y → gets better analysis

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: SKANDER DELCUIZDAD

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: 1309

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec ~~NS~~ HZ

Team Name: NS-FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Hamilton

Victor Zhao

Aislin Flynn

Clairisz Brisson

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

154

200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

159

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Focus on points that are not too case specific, and certainly not too specifically on matters that are not particularly pandemic.

Second Proposition

Focus more on structure and organize ideas more efficiently.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Be wary of using finance-based arguments in debates, i.e. (lack of funds, resources, etc)

Second Opposition

Good structure overall, and a good drive.

Students have a right to a fully subsidized university education
 Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Beaty

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: M132

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ON-KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dan Chiang

Elliott Kaufman

Score
81
100

Score
78 78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nfld-RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Rees

Score
83
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score

159
200

159

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

160
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Dan C.

structural integrity / kill yourself
 repeated 'more so than that' transition (repetitive). Used arguments of the more esoteric aspects of knowledge/maturity/creativity/ and soc. argument of income equality.
 did not attack ways of life in final. good POI challenge

worked human side & did economic as add on.

Second Proposition

Elliott K.

Do not say 'right' repetitively. Acceptance of change toward 'service' rather than manufacturing → university ed as answer assumption of space availability. Clashed specifically & directly.

clash structure thorough.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Michael S. (add you did challenge intent of only those in need.)
 spoke of 'cost benefit analysis' but even when challenged did not offer straight up analysis - used terminology rather than analysis. good point about inflation effects on value of degrees. did keep coming back to economic points (Do not say 'irregardless') ultimately good. POI challenge.

worked societal economic aspect well

Ideal vs. Good
Second Opposition

Dan. Rees.

- weak challenge when you said, effectively 'this is the way it has been'
- resource/trade challenge to 'service' was good. (stats for good)
- when challenged did not take down 'service'
- point on response (ironic as your point had been strong)

neutralized service argument

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matt Blundell

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: 366

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta SV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zack Shapiro

Christopher Vitto

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SASK HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nitasha Selim

Brittany Hamphrey

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

154
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

more rights analysis
excellent PMR

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

concluded that rights that
protect other rights should be protected
that lost you the round

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Murphy O'Connor

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3

Room: M346

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-KD

Team Name: Alberta K-C

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jamal Dumas Arman Kassam

Stephen Cho AliF Karma li

Score
82
100

Score
84
100

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score
166
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score
156 156
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

This debate focused on when the state has a duty to provide services. Gov't said education is provided in much the same way police/fire fighters, because there is a necessity; without some form of post-secondary it is almost impossible to make it. When opposition says that the standard for providing services is "when everyone accesses the service" it becomes difficult owing ~~to~~ because this is not

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

congruous with other services, as gov't points out. I also felt opposition's rebuttal was lacking. They failed to deal with all of the material 1st prop speaker provided; I have two pieces of rebuttal written down in the first opp speech. Where they did challenge many of gov't's claims, these were very implicit; explicit rebuttal in future.