

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BERTOIA

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M232

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA KP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

KELSEY KEDDY

JERIC PAUIG

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ONTARIO KK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

TAE-HU KIM

ANSON KWOK

Score
82
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score

159
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

164
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Noah

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: W234

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario

Team Name: BC AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denison

Valentin

Madeleine Arndt

Sonam Rai

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<del>80</del> <u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>164</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<u>156</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Good plan
- Tell me "why" for constructive point
- Good expl. of irreversible

Second Proposition

- Good sexism through gen. point
- Make sure you remember what you're building
- ↳ about the parent or the child

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Good on "burden"
- only half the roadmap
- Tell me "why" → why medically relevant

Second Opposition

- Remember what a minority or majority debate is

\* 2 equal teams, good style, good road mapping, good pois

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: SARAH

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 234

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario UL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denizhan Uyuk

Valentin Linn

Score
83
100

Score
85
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: B.C. AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeline Armstrong

Sonam Rai

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

168
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

161
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

Good layout. Setting round elsewhere?  
Label your arguments more specifically  
Explain from the beginning affirmative action process.

Better PMR than PMC.

**Second Proposition**

Good refutation.  
Good discrimination argument.  
  
Good speech.  
Be less mean.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

Excellent burden distribution.  
[ I think you had to prove why, if minority is protected vs. majority infringed upon, why gender really matters to know. ]  
Be more specific in your arguments.  
Good style.

**Second Opposition**

Good doctor point.  
Explain why women are entitled to their information, beyond just saying they are.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aaron Schneider

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M234

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario U

Team Name: B.C. AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Opp: Zhan Vyken Valentin Lizon

Madeline Armstrong Sarah R.

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score
164
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
161
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

Good definition of term excluding arguments about Dow's syndrome etc.  
I don't think it was necessary to restrict gender discrimination to immigrant and backgrounds

**Second Proposition**

Good points about government legislation of discrimination. Should have addressed opp's discussion about the fact that gender will come out after birth.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

regretful. Great point about how gender will come out at birth. Should have pressed the point at

**Second Opposition**

Good point about woman's right to know info. Should have more structure.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kiara Kaminski

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M319

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba PT

Team Name: Quebec LS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Pistonius

Adrienne Tessier

Eric Laurin

Janna Shapiro

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

Score
70
100

Score
80
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

Good speaking style  
 a good way to go about  
 think would be to show  
 how not disclosing the sex  
 infers a sense of ~~sex~~ equality.

Second Proposition

Good speaking style.

Both speakers: You needed to prove to me how your plan leads to gender inequality under your model, as you conceded, child abandonment is possible.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Good speaking style.  
 Would have liked to see more analysis on rights.

Second Opposition

Good point on Bantaid solution a good way to strengthen this would be to show how the resolution would leader to more problems (ie - female orphans, murder of girls...)

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Meun

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M319

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - PT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Pistorius      Adrienne Jessier

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec - LS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Enclauson      Janna Shapiro

Score
<u>70</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

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

Team Score

<u>151</u>
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<u>150</u>
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

→ Try to bring more energy to ground  
Clear and calm speaking style.  
Good attempt at rights analysis  
Issue of female discrimination in society was good  
2nd constructive was not well established

**Second Proposition**

Try to analyse the importance of your gender st. arguement.  
More detail of how & why this is a problem.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

Do not introduce new info in reply speech. (Issue of boys working)  
Good speaking style.  
Time management was a problem  
< 1 min of rebuttal is not good as an Op. debater.  
Please keep greater control of the floor when accepting POI's.  
2nd point was good, but needed greater detail to prevent Prop attack of this point.  
Think of consequences for parents and why this justifies right to know!

**Second Opposition**

Good to reconstruct and constructive point of partner.  
Be careful of comparing things like "choosing clothes" to an issue like female infanticide.  
good to focus on larger societal discrimination needs a solution beyond this issue.  
Keep control of the floor when POI's are offered.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: VIRGINIA ROBERTSON

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M319

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba PT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Pistorius

Adrienne Tessier

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec L.S.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Eric Laurin

Janna Shapiro

Score
72
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

151
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

152
200

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments: RYAN

First Proposition

Clear definition - competent speaker

- Rights Analysis - excellent identification (good analysis of issue) of the components of the issue
- Rights of Unborn child - major issue (abortion based on gender - core of argument)
- Duty of Doctors - ?? POT? good question (Janna) → could cause harm
- logical and organized
- Filled time well.

Summary + Rebuttal: returned to key themes - placed arguments in context - Disputed each point opposition made clearly.

Second Proposition

Adrienne

- good question (POT)
- mixed up knowledge + action (POT) (right to know vs. abortion)
- questioned "opposition" - good.
- New pt. → pop. dynamics ?? not new ??
- good example "One Child Policy" = China
- questionable... knowledge regarding fetus
- rebutted "right to know" - local vs global
- not clear on "rights" - confused issue.

Judge's Comments: ERIC

First Opposition

Advanced case line first presented division of case.

- "Right to know"
- Health of the baby
- Benefits for the parents
- Clash "duty of doctor" - do no harm → trustfulness.
- "Right of choice" - good point
- POT question - "rights" - good pt.
- Right of unborn child → not addressed.

Summary + Rebuttal: "Right to know" But cleared up with Janna

Second Opposition

Janna

- good POT regarding duty of doctor
- clearly stated stance
- good summary and good explanation of a point 1st speaker made
- competent speaker
- logical / organized
- good handling of question from Adrienne
- very good speaker → addressed points presented by proposition side (ie bandaid sol'n)
- Role of doctor = protect patients =

Logical / organized / clearly - returned to "right to know" explained (view point)

Doug Neal

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: ~~AME KROGAN~~

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Pius

Score
74
100

Score
70
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sherwin Yusef Zadeh

Yesha Auyang

Score
84
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

144
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- Good outline of points
- A bit of stuttering - unsure
- Got better as debate went on.
- Hard to follow 1<sup>st</sup> point's logic
- China is irrelevant to Canada's situation.
- Not clear how this would lead to gender inequality.

Second Proposition

→ didn't make enough of a case

- Clarified worldwide, not just Canada
- should have defined that initially.
- Investment & caring lead to keeping child
- Contradict partner re: alcohol fetal syndrome
- Good start, rambling more at end. Got off track completely.

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- Good speaker.
- Nice rebuttal of their opening points.
- Parents right to know, Gov't stay out of it.

Second Opposition

- Good job addressing proposition's arguments.
- Clear outline of rebuttal.
- Real issue is parents with extreme interest. → Good point.
- Abandonment & exchanges → could have elaborated.



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lauren Shadley

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 21

Room: U323

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland - RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Pees

Score
74
100

Score
71
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sherwin Yusef-zaden

Yesha Ouyang

Score
81
100

Score
83
100

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

Team Score

145
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Melissa C. Dufrio

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: A333

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Newfoundland R.S.

Team Name: BC. 04.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan Daniel Rees

Shervin Yousef-Zadeh Yesha Ouyang

Score
74
100

Score
72
100

Score
85
100

Score
84
100

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

Team Score
146
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: → good PoIs!  
First Proposition

- Excellent introduction ↳ captivating
- well mapped / organized
- China example - good ↳ bring it back to the motion
- good examples & explanations - do not forget to explain how it relates to the motion - be explicit.
- gender equality - effect of its base - good point.
- Strong concluding statements

Second Proposition

- free of social constraints - good
- investment of love and care - good
- PoIs VERY well dealt with! ↳ investment not compared to economics - good.
- healthy pregnancy - no abuse because unaware of the sex - good!
- well explained!

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Good introduction & well organized.
- Good mapping!
- PoIs well dealt with
- Good concluding statements ↳ good tactical showing the lack on side prop
- solid deconstruction.
- - delaying the inevitable - good!
- - just because child is born, doesn't mean that the parent will be happy - good!

Second Opposition

- Good PoI (1<sup>st</sup>)
- Very well introduced
- Good rebuttal
- assumptions/ideologies well deconstructed
- well organized & explained

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: C. Kusel

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 339

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Qu. G.B

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

M. Gaalians

K. Butt.

Score
75
100

Score
<del>73</del> 73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

A. Duff.

B. M.

Score
80
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
148
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
155
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

• what is the stat. quo.?

- You need to work on speaking more formally - try to lose the "and the like" - too colloquial.
- slow down
- good emotion / eye contact
- Little plan → <sup>important</sup> mostly - "we think"
- POI are very general.
- POI should be a question. <sup>good analogy however</sup>

Second Proposition

↑ \* why didn't you rise on POI for sexism / balancing pt.?

- colloquial.
- Need more organization
- Refutation / Speaking not clear → try to be more confident.
- Not a strong argument vs. stereotyping.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

• Good point - Medical Tourism.

- Good refutation.
- Good organization
- I wouldn't have argued for Canada protecting sexism. <sup>Indo-Canadian example.</sup>
- Preparing for them vs. not having a life at all needs to be addressed.

Second Opposition

- Good POI on Parenting
- 2nd POI short and to the point
- "Might be nice" to plan for a boy ... weak argument.
- Work on organization
- No new points - really.

I would have really gone after them on this. Argue Refut their argument vs. medical tourism

• Look at effects if this motion does pass.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Stephen McCarthy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M339

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Megan Gagliano

Karen Butt

Score
79
100

Score
74
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: NS DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff

Blair MacNeil

Score
80
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

153
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

155
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:

~~First~~ Proposition

(whole team)

- I really liked the focus on gender stereotyping but felt a more societal focus would be more useful (or easier to substantiate).
- Try to be clearer on your stance re abortion vs. sex-specific abortion.

~~Second~~ Proposition

- Point re: "minor things that make kids life worse" wasn't the greatest.

Judge's Comments:

~~First~~ Opposition

(whole team)

- Keep your position clear re: allowing sex-selective abortion
- More analysis on why culture > gender discrim. You said it (which is good) but I want more back-up.
- Nice rebuttal re: practical impacts (not changing parents' stereotypes => not having an impact on the child)

~~Second~~ Opposition

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: William Gibson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M339

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Megan Bagliano

Karen Butt

Score
78
100

Score
73
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~NS~~ DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff

Blair MacNeil

Score
80
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score
151
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- Good constructive basis, but the case suffered somewhat from a lack of a clear case stance
- Could have looked more broadly at social, political
- Try to draw more linkages to stereotypes
- Maybe set it in China?

**Second Proposition**

- Good rebuilding of partner's point about sex-specificity
- Try to make sure you engage with all main oppositors
- Be careful not to concede things to opposition (inevitability of stereotypes)

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- Be clear about whether you are okay with sex-selective <sup>adoption</sup> (we think it was?)
- Had cool analysis about the future of foetus in refutation that would have been better as a constructive point
- Cultural roles constructive could have expanded on

**Second Opposition**

- Good refutation of stereotype point
- "Family planning" is pretty unclear
- Try to demonstrate why knowing sex of foetus is such an important aspect of body rights

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: J. Schurman

No. of Judges:      Round: 4 Room: L310

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: NS - FB

Team Name: Alberta - SV

First Speaker: Aidan Flynn Second Speaker: Claudia Bruscia

First Speaker: Zack Shapiro Second Speaker: Christopher Vertue

Score
88
100

Score
79
100

Score
83
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
167
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
161
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Panionate speaker  
Clear arguments but  
could define scope of  
proposition better  
Good rebuttal

Second Proposition

Did summarize but  
needed more distinct  
development of equality  
arguments & reasons  
~~for~~ during rebuttal

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Good on clash  
Reproductive rights -  
good discussion here  
Rebuttal - too much pulled  
by Proposition

Second Opposition

Starts off strong.  
Trouble with learn the  
hard way argument

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Clarke

No. of Judges: 3 Round:      Room: L310

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: NS - FB

Team Name: Alberta SV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aislin Flynn      Charissa Brisson

Zack Shapiro      Christopher Virtue

Score
86
100

Score
79
100

Score
81
100

Score
78
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

- good organization, premises  
- perhaps stretched too far in terms of the causes of sexism  
  
- great reply speech!

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- opp's best point (infanticide, etc.) was purely mitigatory  
- don't offer other reasons why it might be beneficial for parents to know the sex  
  
- "let them have their ~~male~~ male world" is pretty strong -  
may not have the consequences you think

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: J. Burg

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: L310

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Nova Scotia FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Asim Flann

Clarissa Brisseau

Score
85
100

Score
79
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Alberta SV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zack Shapiro

Christopher Virtue

Score
82
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score
164
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
160
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Very broad defin somewhat damaging, but saved by a tremendous rebuttal speech. Model was a bit unclear until much later in your construction.

Second Proposition

stressed points well, but didn't really rebuild your own case. Please use POI's. I liked your "we won't stand for it" stance.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Very good analysis of resolution, but focus on creating paradoxical ideas for FOV needed to be spent on clarity of your own case. Go for more depth on "infanticide".

Second Opposition

Generally good ideas, but time spent discrediting FOV approach needed to be spent on better case line development. "Learning the hard way" was a difficult sell, but you managed it well.



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kathleen Butler

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 336

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba HW

Team Name: Alberta SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anthony Wightman Michael Honke

Andrew Kim Kat Suikhmushim

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

Score
80
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score

153
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

156
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Comments  
given during  
rounds

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: GEORGE BUEBER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M336

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: MANITOBA HW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ANTHONY WIGHTMAN

MICHAEL HONKE

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ALBERTA SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ANDREW KIM

KAT SVIKHUSHIN

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score

152
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

"NO REASON NOT TO DO THIS" ISN'T A PARTICULARLY PERSUASIVE AFFIRMATIVE APPROACH

FINAL REBUTTAL WAS IN ~~MY~~ <sup>MY</sup> ~~OPINION~~ <sup>OPINION</sup>, MUCH MORE EFFECTIVE THAN THE CONSTRUCTIVE. YOU DEALT VERY WELL WITH OPP'N POINTS, BUT THAT WAS INSUFFICIENT TO CARRY THE BURDEN OF PROOF

Second Proposition

"GENDER EQUALITY IS NOT ENFORCED IN THE WORKPLACE" — YES, IT IS. IN THIS COUNTRY, DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF GENDER IS ILLEGAL.

YOU WERE CORRECT IN NOTING THAT THE "RIGHT" ASSERTED BY OPP'N EXISTS NEITHER HISTORICALLY NOR IN LAW

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

THE "BINDING CONTRACT" TO WHICH YOU REFER WOULD BE MODIFIED BY LEGISLATION, NOT BREACHED (assuming, as we must, the supremacy of Parliament)

THE BALD ASSERTION THAT "BODY RIGHTS CANNOT BE SUPERSEDED" REQUIRED DEVELOPMENT

Second Opposition

CAN TORNER SYNDROME BE DIAGNOSED IN VITRO? IF NOT, HOW IS THAT EXAMPLE RELEVANT?

THE FACT THAT FEMALE CHILDREN ARE NOT ABANDONED DOES NOT NECESSARILY INDICATE THAT FEMALE FETUSES ARE NOT BEING ABORTED

I'M NOT CONVINCED THAT KNOWING SEX IN ADVANCE MAKES ONE A BETTER PARENT

LOGICALLY, IF PARENTS WOULD REJECT A CHILD OF DISAPPOINTING GENDER (AS YOU SUGGEST), HOW IS THAT SUBSTANTIALLY DIFFERENT FROM SEX SELECTION?

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M. K. Jackson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 334

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba HW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anthony Wightman      Michael Hanke

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Alberta SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim      Kat Sukhnushin

Score
79
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
158
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- passionate and fairly articulate
- stronger roadmapping/sign-posting would have helped with organization
- don't lose sight of resolution (make your arguments work for you → e.g. Down's case study)

**Second Proposition**

- you did a fairly good job of rebutting Opp's points
  - your own arguments would have benefitted from stronger organization
  - you offered no P.O.s in the first speech, and many in the second -- try to spread them out.
- \* Good work, everyone \*

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- good P.O.s → short, to the point and well spread-out.
- your two arguments were somewhat similar (both rights-based) but made sense
- good 4-minute.

**Second Opposition**

- your Turner's Syndrome example was a good one, and you could have made a bigger deal of it.
- women's ~~the~~ body rights - good pt.
- take a few more P.O.s.
- be able to validate your points (they could have called you on a few things)

not allow doctors to disclose sex of fetus

### Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Sety

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 4 Room: 226

#### PROPOSITION

#### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia - NR

Team Name: Manitoba - FT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bhreeagh Ross

Ryan Nearing

Ella Thomson

Jocelyn Flan

Score
76
100

Score
70
100

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score
154
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
165
200

#### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments: Bhreeagh  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments: Ella  
First Opposition

*prevalent - pronunciation*

- tried to show 'scientific reasons', however where was the economic/scientific argument about what happens when you get imbalance. (you could have used China/India as reference but did not)

'It is bad' is not enough. Also, jumpy style

- ironically opp used China/India example to support mistreated argument.

- focus on mistreatment of children stronger/not taken down by prop

Second Proposition Ryan

finally, did try ~~establish~~ relative priorities in final speech! *good*

- good clash in rebuttal re ratio + destruction points

Second Opposition Jocelyn

- education was a good alternative which might have proven as a solution

- China example is a Canadian example as that culture lives here (Vancouver?) so pushing Canadian difference was not too relevant.

- ironically spoke of no pressing need to know yet might hurt in miscarriage. - confusion

- did clash effectively & specifically

- did present preparation aspect.

- fluidity yielded effect that opp was clearer.

- mystery argument, as this debate developed, had little effect

*prop did seem less clear on prop.*

*reference on opp.*

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: William Onyiah

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 4

Room: M-344

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Jask HS

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: MB HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brett Haw

Nitah a Jh

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daniel Ky

Allen Fra

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>72</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

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

Team Score
<u>147</u>
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<u>156</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

→ Strong Prop Stone

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

→ Good Stone

Second Proposition

→ More Structure + Rebuttal Needed

Second Opposition

→ Too much hyperbole

Canadian National Debating Championships

Chair

Judge's Name: Murphy O'Connor

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 4

Room: M344

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Sask HS

Team Name: MB HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brittany Huxley / Nafasha Salim

Daniel Huang

Allen Liu

Score
75
100

Score
<del>70</del> 70
100

Score
80
100

Score
76
100

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

Team Score
145
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
156
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Govt's case was poorly framed and dealt with issues that were insufficiently impactful. ~~where~~ ~~good~~ what herons they did posit, were not accurately linked to their case. Opp did a fine job exploring these weaknesses

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Great Job Everyone!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Col

No. of Judges: 3

Round: DR, Fems

Room: 342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: MB-GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

J.J. Gerstien

Ariel Melamedoff

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: OW-AW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Conno/ Ahluwalia

Mate Windsor

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

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

Team Score
153
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
154
200

Gender norms approach was interesting + new but link b/w motion tends to be weak.

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- Too long on intro 2 and a half mins.
- Interesting "Humanization" point link it to the motion clearly! - Great Rhetoric
- Does Blurry Image on screen, make about? "Clash"
- Motion -> Reverse gender norms/stereotypes.
- This is a big stretch... - But good framework for other arguments
- How are they less likely to "get bag" if they know earlier? [on sports - point injury]
- "It doesn't have a purpose" is only an argument if opp doesn't make an argument.

Judge's Comments: Second Proposition

- Good P.O.I. on "you can score for X w/o sex"
- You make the same argument as so. It is very ambitious. = Focus more on point
- You are both amazing speakers. easier to follow
- You contribute greatly to the point by giving a practical link + explanation of how knowing sex value helps -> Male/female Baby snags!
- Why were abortions brought up at the 7 min mark of 2nd speech? - 1 child
- This is -> try to prioritize arguments key
- Now it's just an abortion - great!

Even though they were brief you still have to deal w/ abortion pt. + baby snags

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- I think you refute their point very well.
- Your point about health is well refuted on P.O.I.
- "Gender eq" "sex between legs" - great rhetorically!
- Still get gender discrim in LR.
- Presumably DR: would still know gender w/o?
- Good Response to Gov main point...
- Good analysis of Pink Blimps!
- Good Baby Snags Response
- You needed to hit abortion point - although brief!

Judge's Comments: Second Opposition

- Good intro on M/F differences.
- Don't complain about them many this house as w/w b/c w/w is "useless" "powerless", it's not about that, it's
- More likely to get prenatal screen!
- Gender whatevs better connection than mother + child. - sure. I buy it. - well argued.
- It's also if DR tells parents + if DR knows careful

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jake Roth

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M342

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: MB-GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

J. J. Gerstein

Ariel Malamedoff

Score
<del>75</del> 75
100

Score
<del>79</del> 79
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON-AW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Connor Ahluwalia

Nate Winsor

Score
<del>76</del> 76
100

Score
<del>75</del> 75
100

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

Team Score

<del>150</del> 154
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<del>153</del> 153
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:** - Compelling speaking style <sup>great summary speech!</sup>  
**First Proposition** - well organized

- You told us that gender categories exist, but did not explain why your model solves this problem. In other words, how would disallowing sex disclosure of a fetus result in the gender equality which you strive for? **- NEED CAUSAL LINKS!**

- "A push for gender equality" is not an argument. Tell us why these kinds of things are good.

- "When I see gay dance, I laugh." <sup>yet one of many examples of excellent rhetorical skills. Well done!</sup>

**Second Proposition**

- Good job noting that gender expectations still exist (i.e. boys playing with dolls!) **- NEED MORE CAUSAL LINKS!**

- Fantastic analysis about associating the fetus with a genderized life!

- Wonderful refutation

- You needed to better explain the problems of gender screening in China.

- More analysis needed on abortion

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition** - well-organized first speech  
- "They're going to know in 9 months" good job pointing out a serious flaw in ~~the~~ Proposition's case!

- A POI need not be a question.

- Inadequate analysis of the motion's harms

- The second proposition speaker told us that your medical analysis (i.e. predicting diseases/disorders) is wrong and could be done without knowing the gender. ~~How~~ your response?

- Not much engagement with what prop said

**Second Opposition**

- Model issues should come out in the first speech.

- Talking about the UN did not address the motion and was, essentially, irrelevant.

- Most of your speech was based on why the model won't solve anything, while such an argument can be sound, you needed to demonstrate serious harms of the motion.



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Skandar Belonizad

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M 342

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: M6 - GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

J.J. Carstein

Ariel Melamedoff

Score
<b>82</b>
100

Score
<b>75</b>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON - AW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Connor Ahlwaliz

Nabe Winsor

Score
<b>83</b>
100

Score
<b>75</b>
100

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

Team Score
<b>157</b>
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
<b>158</b>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*Excellent structure and presentation (novice university debater level?).*

*Main criticism would have to go towards the content of the arguments. Side gov has essentially failed to justify the points made by side gov by answering side Opp's simple question on how things turn out differently if the parents discover gender after birth.*

Second Proposition

*Considering the nature of the model, could have emphasized more on the topic of gender-related abortions, demographic results, etc.*

*Although good points were apparent in the round, could have been better with a more organized structure, makes things easier to follow for judges.*

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*Good analysis overall, and good clear points. Rebuttal was excellent as well. Could have brought up cliché but always handy argument of "body rights".*

Second Opposition

*The focus on UN institutions and their inability to initiate bills is not advisable. Shift the debate to an entirely different theatre (which is rather irrelevant)*

↑

*Never make an argument that "side government's resolution does not do enough." Something is always enough, focus more on negative effects of side gov policy.*

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Debra Miko

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: m346

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: BC-KD

Team Name: NWT-HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jamal Dumas

Armaan Kassam

Greg Hanna

Emily Smith

Score
84
100

Score
83
100

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

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

Team Score

167
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

149
200

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

well Done! Great Road mapping. Kept focused.  
Could have mentioned Risks involved in testing. And emphasised Culture.  
Great Reply.

Second Proposition

Excellent! Great Road mapping.  
Clean up more what was left behind from the 2 first speakers

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Need to clarify your role as first speaker!  
Stay focused.  
Great Speaking... nice Volume & pause for effect.

Second Opposition

Need to read map.  
Nice presenter.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Catherine Holloway

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M346

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: BC - KD

Team Name: MWT - HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jamal Dumas      Armaan Kassam

Greg Hanna      Emily Smith

Score
84
100

Score
84
100

Score
72
100

Score
70
100

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

Team Score
168
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
142
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

Excellent points, lots of information  
that was very valuable

However, slowing down a little  
(saying a little less) will make  
it easier for judges to absorb  
your points

**Second Proposition**

Good balance of solid  
argumentation and  
style

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

Strong public speaking style

Needs more substance

- strongest points on this side  
should come out during  
this speech

**Second Opposition**

Work on managing time  
more effectively

A lot of this speech's job  
is REFUTATION.

Make sure you address  
all of 2<sup>nd</sup> prop's points

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mr. A. Langlois

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M346

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC - KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jamal Dumas

Armaan Kassam

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NWT HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Greg Hanna

Emily Smith

Score
78
100

Score
75
100

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

Team Score

168
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

153
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

good use of POIs  
breath - you are talking way too fast

↑  
strong argumentation  
and clashing

**Second Proposition**

work on your rebuilding

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

you were close to espousing  
colonialism - be careful with your  
argumentation

give more POI's →

z

strongest pt should be given by CO  
not MO

**Second Opposition**

you need to work on your road  
mapping

you didn't clash and refute the  
MP's arguments

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katherine Fe

No. of Judges: 3

Round: A

Room: N343

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hastings

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: OC TO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jeremy Orland

Don Ten-Thot

Score
76
100

Score
78
100

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

Team Score

149
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

<del>155</del>
200

154

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- effectively showed problem in the status quo, however didn't clearly state means to fundamentally alter social perceptions

**Second Proposition**

- making points very clear at the outset will make them more persuasive
- more <sup>direct</sup> refutation is necessary

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- although constructive arguments were a little repetitive and could have used more nuance regarding the importance of the process and choice made during birth, refutation was effective.

- point of refutation regarding the allowed termination of children was particularly strong

**Second Opposition**

- good constructive material which really attacked the core of the case
- better organization and more refutation would have added to this speech

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lorelie DeRoose

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M343

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Alberta HL

Team Name: Quebec TO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Jeremy Obrand

Dan Tom-That

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

Score
77
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

151
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- trivial desire - irrelevant - too much time. (watch saying that about fail)
- societal loss - overall abortion arg. make relevant to gender.
- did not make case line clear.
  - difference in facade illegal → good but soon. abortion legal
- don't characterize as hastily...

Second Proposition

- watch use of time on less relevant point.
- women jobs - what present still marginalize women's roles
  - contradict - internet sure women - internet can't get rid of stigmas.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- focus POI - get to heart of assumptions better → willing to risk. ↑ abortion / post birth murder? ✓ good
- nice style - more structure to rebuttal
- want view equal - yet Dr. is that of mother, not child?
- how is gender relevant to health?
  - focus more on topic, less slipstap
- watch contradictions / nice style.

Second Opposition

- v. good analysis, logical breakdown + approach to ideas
- all → be clear on your pts. watch for contradictions within your cases.

all speakers very pleasant to listen to

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ryan Rogers

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M343

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta-HL

Team Name: Quebec-TO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Jeremy Obrand

Dan Ton-That

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Score
77
100

Score
79
100

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

Team Score

149
200

161  
This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

156
200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

A very confident speaker with excellent speaking style. You brought solid constructive material to the round that touched on the key pro points of this case. First point on Trivial desire could have been a little more flushed out. You responded to POs well and the Caseline (Centering demand preventing gender-specific abortion) was clear. Especially near the end of the speech I felt you were dragging time a bit and being repetitive; try to avoid this by pushing out your points more. Good build down but needed to address infanticide more and I think you missed some key opportunities for rebuttal.

Second Proposition

You had a very long preamble, try and get to the point faster or it comes across that you are dragging out your time. The third 'pillar' of gender bias was well explained, but since this is the key argument for your side it should have been your first point in the first speech. You are a good speaker, but your speech had not enough substance although the style was good. You took 3 POs and spent a lot of time responding to them, which again felt like you were trying to use up your time. A specific rebuild of your partners points would have been a good thing to include. The PO on infanticide was not sufficiently answered, and I think you missed some key rebuttal opportunities.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

For example mother-baby bonding was fine for thousands of years before sex could be determined. I understood your approach/caseline of parents having the right to know, but your arguments about the risks of parents not being able to know seemed weak - these did not seem to stack up to the serious threat of gender-selective abortion, the 'disconnect' did not seem to be serious. You also said parents need to know the gender for medical reasons, but according to their model in this case it would be okay to reveal the gender. You had some good points in your second argument about further implications, and talked about infanticide which is a relevant concern. Rebuttal was comprehensive, but could have been better organized if you did more of a point-by-point rebuttal. Speaking style is very strong. Good build down.

Second Opposition

→ Second opp speaker said this as well. I did not find your argument on social implications brought very much to the round - you said this would reinforce the images of gender inequality but that is like saying we shouldn't solve a problem because it would draw attention to that problem, that is not a good reason to not try and address the problem, so there is a bit of a flaw in the argument. Fourth point on practical extensions was good, I like how you continued to bring up the issue of infanticide, and how they had not refuted that argument - nice! You spoke well and had a very thorough reconstruction.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Emma O'Rourke-Friel

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M328

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK - WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

Score
<del>77</del> 77
100

Score
<del>78</del> 78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON - JM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anastair Smith

Taraing Macatne

Score
84
100

Score
81
100

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

Team Score
155
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
105
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

This case got muddled pretty quickly. Starting the round in Canada does make the case lower-impact → also it is not clear that the liberalization of culture will occur after enacting bill.

**Second Proposition**

liked argument about role of data → perhaps one of strongest constructive arguments. good refutation.

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

aid out a very clear opp case → hit all major issues. Gov was right to part out that you dropped some of their material, but you did focus on important info. and that was fine.

**Second Opposition**

Great argument about doctor-patient relationship was muddled. Reconstruction would benefit from new approach or examples as to differentiate it from LO's speech.



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lyle Dobbin

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: 328

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: SK-WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: OWT-SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alastair Smith

Truong Minh

Score
84
100

Score
82
100

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

Team Score
154
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
166
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Good model, clear parameters for debate.
- Cultural argument was ~~was~~ a little strange, if multiculturalism is a Canadian value, taking away rights from target cultures seems inverse
- Great style

Second Proposition

- Careful on your assertions about purpose of law. Is it to shape our values? or just harms reduction.
- Role of doctor was the right constructive

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Great speech, identified core of this debate quickly.
- good to claim multiculturalism for your side
- Rebuttal was effective, but could have been better if more specific

Second Opposition

- Best individual point in round, wrong title though. Trust.
- Good handling of examples

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Evan Weiner

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M-329

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: GH - WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: OU - SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alastair Smith

Tarang Mavathe

Score
<u>84</u>
100

Score
<u>81</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>165</u>
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- Did not layout a clear case, particularly was kind of awestruck point
- PMR was your much better speech
- The intermarriage point was off topic - how is that bad
- Would have liked you to talk more about the practical lawrence

**Second Proposition**

- Missed a couple great opportunities for rebuttal, liked your point on the role of doctor a

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- Good points - liked the Bdx rights arguments and how you dealt with your POIs
- Did drop some material but you did focus on the important things

**Second Opposition**

- Liked the rebutting, the rebutment point was a bit weird (easy to relate but prop never did)

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Amar

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2<sup>5th</sup> Room: 132

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: NFLD WN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Morgan

Kate

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ON NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaitlyn

Norman

Score
79
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
158
200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

SPLIT DECISION  
2-1 OPP

Excellent encapsulatory rhetoric - establishing evolving and problematic cultural norms justified for me the use of restricting information; the stereotyping material was interesting, but the rights-and-sex argument carried best.

Excellent PMR material, but messy.  
**CLARITY + CONFIDENCE!**

Second Proposition

Very strong argument about protecting mothers; needed to be in PMR. Good examples.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

appeal to material analysis at bottom of LOC: problematic when met w/ pro material

I felt that while opps material was well articulated, it generally wasn't connected to the issues in the gov case.

I didn't feel like the 'undergrounding' argument worked with the rhetoric that established the small scale of the procedure; I also felt like the harmonization absent.

I was also unconvinced by the 'gov can't regulate ethics' material, and the stuff about no longer trusting doctors was not explained sufficiently.

Second Opposition

Good to put conservative ahead of rebuttal. However, I felt a lot of the rebuttal was unconvincing - I feel like laws exist to articulate positions on workers; I don't feel like the 'attitudes' material meaningfully clashed w/gov, and I found opposing 'change the law' with 'the law' to miss the debate, albeit narrowly.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Patrick Peatto

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 2

Room: M132

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland WN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Morgan Welsh

Kate McNeil

Score
77
100

Score
78
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaitlyn Meloche

Norman Nehmetallah

Score
79
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

155
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

159
200

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

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

> you were best refuting pts. in final summation

> nerves are something to control

**Second Proposition**

> strong reply to PO 1

> needed more substantive development

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

> presentation skills are strong

> watch strength of argument - buying clothes?

**Second Opposition**

> strong presentation skills

> little too repetitive at times

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julie Wagner

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M132

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Newfoundland ~~WN~~ WN

Team Name: Ontario NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Morgan Walsh

Kate McNeil

Kaitlyn Meloche

Norman Mehmetallah

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

Score
80
100

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

Team Score

156
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Didn't buy gender stereotypes  
BUT really strong points in  
PWR (ex: evolving nature of  
laws) - this should have been  
brought up earlier!

Second Proposition

Interesting arguments,  
well-presented

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

On the whole,  
some individual  
points weaker/  
less relevant but  
I think on  
the whole you brought  
up more salient points  
and related prop's  
main arguments

Second Opposition

not disclose sex of judges.

### Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: R. Smith.

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M225.

#### PROPOSITION

#### OPPOSITION

Team Name: Jubilee CM.

Team Name: Saskatchewan T.R.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Melissa Cape.      David Masovitch

Abdul Rehman.      Gulraiz Torrig.

Score
77.
100

Score
74.
100

Score
75
100

Score
75
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: Melissa  
 First Proposition

- Social Stigma → Well-developed pt.
- Misuse of Medicine → To a lesser extent.
- Good rebuttal by clarifying into the 3 points.
- Watch the use of repetition at the end.

Judge's Comments: Abdul  
 First Opposition

Be careful: "Is a right - inherently a right that should never be questioned?"

You began in the right direction → Culture of India → Jerry's → needed to develop that point a bit more.

Slow down in prep presentation.

Second Proposition David

Good point in support of partner: Spreading the message that journals are important which will be long-term effect.

- Try and tighten up your organization a bit.

Second Opposition Gulraiz

Stayed with "rights" issue and said there are alternatives, but didn't really go into those alternatives → just education.

Strong speaking style.

Maybe could have gone into how important are the Doctors in all of this?

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: COLE BRICKER

No. of Judges: 2

Round: \_\_\_\_\_

Room: M 325

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Melissa Cope

David Marcovitch

Score
76
100

Score
74
100

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: SASK TR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Abdul-Rahman

Guillaume Toriz

Score
73
100

Score
72
100

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

Team Score

150
200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

145
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

RFD: Debate generally suffered from lack of clarity and engagement from both sides. Gov modeled this in India ~~and~~ (slightly odd but acceptable), yet only presented ~~what~~ what amounted to 1 substantive point about women's rights. Opp conceded most of gov's case, while only presenting arguments about the importance of having these concessions, coupled with unconvincing alternatives. Because of these concessions, coupled with unconvincing alternatives, debate was awarded to gov.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Paul Judul

No. of Judges: 03

Round: 04

Room: 325

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec CM

Team Name: Sask TR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Melissa Cape

David Marcovitch

Abdul Rahman

Galvaiz Tariq

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

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

Team Score
149
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score
147
200

**PROPOSITION** / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
~~First~~ Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
~~First~~ Opposition

Position on abortion was not consistent. The case did, however, stand at the end of the day.

Overall, opp had some good material but ~~she~~ was unwilling to take a strong stance opposing the case. They did not seem willing to support a person's right to abort a fetus on the basis of gender.

~~Second~~ Proposition

~~Second~~ Opposition