95 Dionne McNeff - Emerson

Open Public Forum R5 - 2:00

Room: E3 455

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: Also ASAP

Flip for sides: Flintridge Preparatory LKEG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
NEG	Lauren Kim	3	26
NEG	Eliza Gunter	2	27

Flip for sides: Kudos College of Youth Leadership SSEJ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
AFF	Sunny Sun 1st	4	25
AFF	Ellie Jiang 2nd	1	28

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Emerson

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Lauren: good stat re: less R+D (9 approved v. 31 currently). Diff to tackle diseases would get less attention – good pt.
Counterfeit drugs good pt as well. No eye contact in opening.
mispronounced "bureaucracy" Did a good job on pt. about price contr in '70s in U.S.

Sunny: people can't afford to take drugs they need – good pt. Good eye contact.
Opioid crisis* – misuse of drugs is off-topic. Didn't drive it back to the poin
Insurance premiums* – didn't tie it directly to argument either
*in cross you made the point that cure is too expensive but got lost in openi
in summary you tied it in better.
you both told me mult. times that you were "winning" – I would rather hear arguments to be convinced.

Eliza: good pt. re: generic shortages and R+D Did a good job staying on point, refuting pts. Opioid pt. – good that you brought up actual drug name
Good pacing did a good job listening/refuting. Some argument veered toward keeping pharma cos. making same amt of $ and that isn't so strong. Good job on refuting opioid pt.

Ellie: good pt. re: Orphan Drug Act. Good ex. re: Hep C drug.
- Said price controls will benefit drug cos in long run but no basis provided
- Good pt. re: black mkt. Poised

David

96 ~~Rachel Galvan~~ - ELAC

Open Public Forum R5 - 2:00

Room: E3 507

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only Tournament

Round Start: ASAP Neg | Aff **Ballot Due: Also ASAP**

Flip for sides: Kudos College of Youth Leadership AYHZ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Ava Ye	3	28
2	Helaine Zhao	1	30

Flip for sides: Flintridge Preparatory WFBK

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Wyatt Fishman	4	27
2	Bryce Kim	2	29

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ___

David Rogers
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Elac
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Good Job to both teams

Aff -> • For many ppl economy = life (1930's)

Neg -> • [illegible]
The shortage of Mds is too much of a "what is"

~~AFF~~ Neg

• Need innovation to help.

↳ more people buying, less accessible (inflation due to shortage).

- price controls don't have a set price / amount.
- Die b/c they don't have the cures. Don't have the money to do the cures.
- Developing a drug is $$$.
- set the prices high to make more.
- Most Americans use generic.
- Price controls will take time. Will take many years to impose these controls.

• created a shortage.

↳ less access to other.

↳ won't have enough money to make more.

• Not sure abt the card.

- prof. Davis = not save $$$ enjoy one time cost reduction.
- Wouldn't happen right away. prices will never be at equilibrium (but how?)

• Can't negotiate b/c of supply in demand.

• I see the argument being made but, wrongly stated.

↳ only enjoy 1 time cost reduction

↳ only 2% att of health bill. won't affect consumers that much.

→ time being taken to pass means that time isn't going into helping people.

~~NEG~~ AFF

• Afford more brand drugs.

↳ price control a 1 time thing & wouldn't help much.

→ Never stated = not completely [illegible].

↳ can be negotiable

- how innovation is harmed; money will be made less (basic logic)
- more people will buy, maybe even more b/c of an ↑ people purchasing if prices were affordable.
- Contradict in the statistics.

↳ Many can't afford.

• what is connecting?

↳ if drugs were in high demand, wouldn't there be money to make the drug

• Most Americans use generics; where's your evidence.

• Any evidence?

↳ never gave a card.

- A lot of Americans aren't accessible in general.
- contradicting evidence.
- costs are so high
- set limit = price control def.

• 20% or 50% would be too high or too low. There could be a compromised reach.

• After length amt. of time; even if it takes time it doesn't matter. (Negative consequences?)

- The more people that need it, will get it.

→ shortage wouldn't be much of a problem?

- delayed = better than not getting it at all

99 Kaitlyn Gonzalez - ELAC

Open Public Forum R5 - 2:00

Room: E3 525

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: Also ASAP

Flip for sides: Westridge School TWDV

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
Neg	Tanya Wei	4	25
Neg	Dahlia Vogel	3	27

Flip for sides: Emerson Community Charter School MRKC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
Aff	Marcus Razo	2	~~30~~ 29
Aff	Katie Cohen	1	30

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ___

K. Galz
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

ELAC
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

NEG

- Fed govt. shouldn't.
- more benefits from not increasing prices.
- Innovaters will pursue less.
- premature mortality.
- 13 new drugs.
- reducing profits will lower new innovations/research.
- Pharm. companies will have to reduce budget (??)
- Costs for developing new drugs have increased.

- drug spending ↑ more than overall health care spending.
- take off 2% total.

AFF

→ Price: reduce the prices.
→ dont take meds? b/c of high cost.
↳ don't take meds as prescribed; in order to save $$.
↳ people would take meds if meds prices were ↓.
→ [illegible]
13.50 → $750 /tablet
→ Solely benefit monoplies they are established
→ dont have neg effects if implemented correct (Shelia)

→

100 Michael Yee - Emerson

Open Public Forum R5 - 2:00

Room: E3 553

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: Also ASAP

Flip for sides: Westridge School MNKX

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
C	Mia Nagai L	4	26
C	Katie Xu R	3	27

Flip for sides: Kudos College ~~of Youth~~ Leadership TLCL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
P	Tony Lu L	2	28
P	Clinton Lau R	1	29

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ___

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

EMERSON

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

KATIE XU - SPEAK SLOWER, ANNUNCIATE.

TONY LU - GOOD POINTS, BUT SPEAK SLOWER

MIA NAGAI - GOOD EYE CONTACT. PASSION, BUT NEED BETTER FACTS

CLINTON LAU - GOOD EYE CONTACT AND PASSION TOO BUT MAYBE LESS YELL-Y.

Brian Ha

98 **~~Uriel Jimenez Cholula~~ - ELAC**

Open Public Forum R5 - 2:00

Room: E3 521

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: Also ASAP

Flip for sides: Academy of Higher Learning JPSJ (-)

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Jun-Woo Pak	3	26
2	Soren Jensen	1	27

Flip for sides: Kudos College of Youth Leadership DWCL (+)

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Danielle Workman	2	27
2	Chloe Leong	4	26

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ___

Brian Ha

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

ELAC

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

(-)
1. Good start to debate, a little quiet at first but that was not a problem later on.
2. Great use of moving debate back on track. Very good at delivering evidence.

(+)
1. Good use of evidence credibility and use of contingency that "whoever best benefits citizens wins debate"
2. Good delivery of evidence. Sometimes sounded a little unsure at times.

R.F.D. most of affirmation arguments were centered around evidence in the end. Negation moved it back and even cited how affirmation also used "outdated or non-credible evidence."

Neg

- Fill the criterion } way to lose
- Prove that the aff. saves more lives
- Don't feel like they have to prove how many can't afford the medication

Aff

- Prices are useless
  - ↳ Poe useless
  - Already cheap
- 5.4m lost jobs due to price controls
- Speed price decreases
  - Gov. prices would go up

- Opioids
  - ↳ deals w/ the pharma industry
  - ↳ does not deal w/ price controls
  - ↳ Aff - price are safe
  - ↓ increases prices therefore not saving lives
- Robert Books: Federal regulations increase prices
- 4.5 million jobs
- Imp. 60 billion $ lost due to P.C
- P.C lose investors
  - ↳ low profit
  - ↳ low investment = loss of investors
  - ↳ lives are safe w/o price controls
- Billion dollar comp. will not settle for less money

Prep time: 32 secs

going over Neg case

1) innovations
- ~~[illegible]~~
- $1 19 go to marketing
- Don't need
- Buying back their own stocks
- Product 2018
- Wards 2011
- 5th: innovation and prices are not connected
- 2nd contention: P.C useless (Neg)
  - 100/ month
  - P.C reduce prices = saving lives
- Shortages: supp. & demand do not show in
- 3rd: open market industry: show the econ is different everywhere
- ~~[illegible]~~ opioids: lower cost best way to save lives 71k people died in 2017

- 2nd contention: Price controls cause shortages = heighten drug
  - Companies cannot make as much money as before due to loss of profit

- 5th res: innovation
  - P.C have no affect on innovation
  - Since 2008 P.C increase demand
- 3rd response to 3rd point:
  - Not unique due to no shortages because nobody is buying it because it's so expensive

---

Prep time: 1:00

Generic drugs are already competing against each other because they are cheaper.

Money is being used to buy back all. ← P.C will prevent from funding that

Unique: Federal regulations

2nd: 71,728 2018

Drug shortages: Because of P.C

3rd response: Shortages do not occur because nobody can afford

Missed 2nd point

Prove why should America have P.C in order to raise prices?

Medication: more expensive - Not true } why? proof

Inevitable Canada and Europe

Shortages because they are being [illegible]

↳ opp. No shortages because drugs are expensive

Said exactly what the pass stated

Neg: Misunderstood cont. #2

2:00 4.5 million jobs are saved

5th no response

I bring an example that all drugs are cheap ↳ 10 talk ab generic

Dropped arg. 2

Dropped with 49.5% against

Interviewed generic drugs: ↳ prescription drugs are not [illegible] investment

Europe P.C since 1984

2:00

94 Santiago Lopez - ELAC

Open Public Forum R5 - 2:00

Room: E3 457

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: Also ASAP

Flip for sides: Wilshire Academy CSCL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)	
N	Clara Son	2	29	2nd speaker
N	Christine Lee	1	30	1st speaker

Flip for sides: Flintridge Preparatory GVDC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)	
A	Gabi Varga	4	27	2nd speaker
A	Daniel Choi	3	28	1st speaker

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ___

Santiago Lopez
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

ELAC
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Neg Notes: 4:00

- lives are saved &
- Price control stifle innovation
- No new drugs will be created
- 60 Billion and million
  - Lives & jobs are being loss
- Lost due to price controls
- P.C: useless because they are already cheap
  - walk out w/ cheap prices
- Sb B: PC can make things more expensive
  - Need to make up for losses
- Jan. 2018 pg for medication increase prices & reduce
- Taxes are raised on the citizens

Aff Notes:

- Saving lives -> irreversible
- opponents death has gone up
- 1K / month
- Breadwinning finding comes out of pocket
- Poor people given options
  - can't afford other
  - higher for students w/ high poverty levels
- Americans lose 127 million dollars
- Cont. Medication abandonment
  - Skip prescription
  - lose money
  - die
- 23% for scholars
- $252 infancy care
  - higher dropout rates
- prices lower, the quality of life
- 125,000 deaths
  - Hospitalization
  - 1 billion / year

97 **Jordyn Alexis - ELAC**

Open Public Forum R5 - 2:00

Room: E3 511

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: Also ASAP

Flip for sides: Wilshire Academy ALKA

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
2 A	Alex Lee	2	24
1 A	Kriste An	1	25

Flip for sides: Flintridge Preparatory RDAR

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1 N	Rachel Demerit	3	24
2 N	Anya Rose	4	23

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ___

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

ELAC

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff: Fantastic argument and rebuttals! Did well under pressure, both 1 and 2 have fantastic public speaking and reasoning abilities

Neg: Great debate! You had good contentions and good support in arguments

This round was very hard to determine a winner. It was very engaging