| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would nationalise all essential services (such as communication, energy, transportation, etc) |
| --- |

| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Excellent pushback in the hook on the state’s lack of capacity! Conclude this by saying this will end up affecting their own metric on affordability.   * Yes they already conceded that they will implement a hybrid model, but why is proposing this damaging to Prop’s case?   Good use of grounding that in developing countries, these services are quite affordable. But if you look into European states, electricity bills are unaffordable and causing a humanitarian issue.   * We can suggest a counterfactual on subsidising the costs without taking over the entire market.   We cannot just assert that competition exists in the free market, because Prop has mechanised that a few companies entirely dominate the entire market of essential goods and services.   * Counter with a different business model as to why companies on the Opp’s side will still make significant profit margins even when making these services affordable.   I appreciate that state regulations can exist to limit exploitative corporate behaviour.   * But Prop has engaged by stating that corporations have a lot of wealth and lobby for deregulation instead. * So we have to explain why the state has the ability to do this effectively.   + Eventually, we said why federal agencies can easily suspend business licenses if they are found in violation. Try to weigh this against the power of lobbying.   + Also, how do you get innovation if you are implementing the kind of laws that significantly crack down on profits? * We’re spending so much time on the red herring of the state bypassing their own laws for efficiency, move on because this doesn’t move the needle on any of the issues.   Excellent pushback that innovation is actually needed within essential services.   * But Prop has pointed out that the state also has incentive to achieve cost-efficiency for the same reasons, so they will conduct innovation. * So we need to spend time reinforcing why the state will not actually conduct innovation even if their incentives align, this is a capacity issue.   We needed to engage with their point on accountability and explain why states are often not held accountable when they abuse the nationalisation model.   * Explain what are competing ‘voting issues’ that tend to outweigh the voters’ appreciation for public services.   + Point out that consumers make excuses for state inefficiency, but we don’t do so for companies.   Well done on your argument building of companies becoming a monopoly after bidding for the state contract, and this leads to an oligopoly.   * But is any of this materially different from how companies operate in the status quo? Prop already stated that oligopolies dominate essential industries. * We’re still spending time on the mechanisation of how the same companies keep getting selected, when this part is not contentious. * The contentious part is the impact which we only spent 5 seconds on.   + Shouldn’t the contract include some regulation on pricing and bad business practices since that was the whole point of nationalisation.   Good job offering POIs.  7.32 - Watch for time!! | | | | | | |