| **Student Name:** Jasmine Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** In times of economic crisis, this house would introduce legislation to increase labour flexibility |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Nice pushback that the solution to a crisis should not come at the expense of workers, but now we’re pondering what exactly is Opp’s pathway to dealing with this crisis?   * Your first speaker did not offer Opp’s counterfactual on how to keep these businesses afloat during an economic crisis! So give me a comparative so that exclusively you’re the only one who can actually protect workers.   + Suggest tax incentives for businesses who do keep their workers.   + The government can also give moratoriums for any fees that need to be paid to the state.   + You’re the first to mention bailing out businesses!     - This is typically used for a few, large businesses. Are we able to do this for the average business?       * We can’t move away too fast after stating this, spend time mechanising this model and tell me why it’s MORE viable than Prop’s pathway of labour flexibility.   Good rebuttal that lingering financial anxiety means the economy will still fail to recover.   * However, all of these economic harms if Prop is proving that MORE jobs are lost overall in your world. We need to deal with this contention first.   + Can we weigh whose side actively loses more jobs on a scale?   When we’re insisting on the legitimacy of labour rights, expand the moral claim underlying this.   * We should suggest that if the state is willing to trade-off labour rights during a crisis, these measures are often long-lasting and go on even after the downturn ends. * Those businesses will lobby for its continuance, and once we conceded that labour rights are not fundamental human rights, it will be much easier to continue compromising on it. * On labour unions, we need to explain how much they have sacrificed to get to this level of advocacy and collectivism.   + Then analyse why union busting Prop is engaging in will likely be something that they cannot recover from. * Spend way more time on the human costs of these workers!   + I’m hearing a brand new mech of welfare in the middle of the speech again, tell your 1st speaker to say this.   After explaining that the poorest are hurt, we can expand this argument on a macro-scale to the entirety of the working-class if we argue about shifting the power to rich and powerful businesses!   * Analyse specifically why workers are powerless to fight against businesses if the state does not intervene with federal regulations, e.g. how financially desperate they are, they lack options, and workplace intimidation, etc. * In the weighing, could we deal with Prop’s winning framing that when businesses die, then more jobs are lost anyways?   + Point out that the deterioration of the framework of labour rights could also be permanent even after the crisis recovers, this would be your winning pathway because the clash on securing jobs is washed out at this point.   Good bottom line on labour exploitation. We need to use some rhetoric and characterisation on how severe is the human costs being suffered by the people, e.g. are they working in conditions hazardous to their health?   * Good analysis on disposable income playing a role in economic recovery as well.   + But how do I contrast this with Prop using the exact same analysis as to why businesses have to stay open in order to achieve the same recovery. * On your economic harms, the better analytical focus would’ve been on the broad societal collapse that follows wide-scale unemployment and low quality of life.   Good job offering POIs today!  6.05 | | | | | | |