| **Student Name:** Kelly Au |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that countries with ageing populations should significantly relax requirements for immigration instead of incentivising birth |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Interesting hook about this being an excuse to let refugees in, but why can’t the state actively control the amount and type of people coming into your country?  On allowing low-skilled people into your country, is there a reason why the state would accept the kind of workers that their economy does not need?   * We could’ve pushed back and explain that on Opp, you still have SOME immigration policies to accept precisely ONLY the foreign workers that the country needs. But in Prop, they MUST accept a large volume if they’re using it as a solution to an ageing population. * Good characterisation why Prop’s policies would only attract low-skilled workers, however, why is this necessarily harmful?   + Prop has highlighted that ageing societies are highly educated and lack the kind of labour supply for low-skilled jobs, so it’s not a harm to attract these workers.   On your counter set-up:   * Good clarity on pro-natalist policies, actively point out that none of these policies are coercive.   + We need to expand the persuasiveness of your incentives. * What is your winning framing?   If your society is already lacking workers, then even low-income workers are a net addition to your economy as opposed to not having enough workers to begin with.   * We need to explain the harms to labour dynamics, i.e. the oversaturation of one type of workers lead to the kind of overcompetitiveness that will deflate the market rate of wages, and steal jobs away from locals who will have to then turn to the state for welfare.   We continue to assert that these economies are not attractive enough to bring in foreign workers, but there was never any clear reasoning as to why!   * There’s plenty of less developed economies who offer weaker opportunities versus those in ageing societies which are typically far more developed.   Our strategic focal point is weak, we need to actively defend the comparative of pro-natalist policies being the solution to an ageing society! Just criticising immigration does not mean that Opp has a better alternative to deal with the problem in the status quo.  On these workers being a social burden, this makes little sense for people who are issued work visas and therefore, they all have disposable income and actively pay taxes to the state.   * What you’re referencing are refugees, which are an entirely different group to economic migrants. These people will be accepted based on an entirely different set of policies.   The key point to your second argument should’ve been on the temporary vs permanent nature of the solution to an ageing society.   * It doesn’t matter if the migrants do not have children of their own, they are the ones actively replacing the low birth rate themselves!   + We need to analyse why these migrants are only here temporarily, and we cannot manage the potential economic risks of them exiting the nation.   Please offer more POIs today!  7.05 - Good timing! | | | | | | |