| **Student Name:** Dominic Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that governments should not bail out banks deemed ‘too big to fail’ |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 8 minutes’ long.]  The individual parallel is nice, but feels slightly more kiddy.   * Push it with more urgency by spelling out the ways in which the banks engaged in the specific habits and risky behaviours that led to this crisis/needing a bail out. * We sound a little bit shaky at the start, try to write out your hook so you can present with a lot more fluidity.   On the set-up:   * I appreciate that the money can be reinvested on dealing with the harms of bailouts such as the well-being of workers.   + But how do we get out of the crisis? What is our positive path to victory? * We need to explain what else we’ll do to ensure these banks don’t gain more risk, and how they can be more sustainable. This can look like:   + Bringing back the regulatory reforms as we discussed, to make it so that banks are not relying on predatory practices, and taking high-risks at the consumers’ expense.   + We could introduce regular and rigorous stress tests that realistically assess banks' ability to withstand severe economic shocks.   + Extend regulations and oversight, including hedge funds, private equity firms etc.   On your first argument:   * Good work characterising the culture at big banks, and why they will be competitive and accountable. But if that’s the case, then why did they engage in such terrible practices within a free market?   + Instead, spend more time linking how it is precisely the bail outs that set these banks up into risk taking behaviour further. Let’s point to how this will remove the implicit guarantee that encourages excessive risk-taking. We need to explain why no set of regulations can succeed without this specific change; we need to link it to the influence these banks hold over the state.     - Large banks employ armies of lobbyists and contribute heavily to political campaigns, giving them significant influence over policymakers.     - Over time, regulatory agencies can become "captured" by the industries they are supposed to regulate.     - The movement of individuals between government regulatory agencies and the financial industry (the "revolving door") further blurs the lines and can lead to regulatory capture. * Good conclusion why the government’s hands are tied and they are pressured to bail out when the time comes.   + On the moral hazard, expand how this will affect consumers as well, not just the banks.   The claim that the banks will no longer take terrible corporate decisions if bail-outs are not offered is not exactly clear. Many of them do make high-risk decisions even when bail-outs are not a certainty.   * The response to the POI makes it clearer that they learned from the 2008 global financial crisis as to why bailouts have become a certainty in their business model. Good job.   On your second argument:   * Good moral push on the culpability of these companies and their exploitative ways. * After explaining that the bail-outs actively reward these terrible companies, we need to argue this is in a way that is distinct to the first argument.   + We’re running a half principle here, what is actually the moral harm? Actively outline what is the role of the government, and why this betrayal of confidence matters in the debate.   Good job offering POIs today!  8.27 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |