



site: [www.NLSDU.com](http://www.NLSDU.com) • email: [Info@NLSDU.com](mailto:Info@NLSDU.com)

# **Debater's Guide**

## **to**

# **Cross-Examination**

## **Debating**



|  |    |
|--|----|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....  | 2  |
| How it differs from other styles .....   | 2  |
| Modified* Oxford format (two-person teams) .....   | 4  |
| II. SPECIAL CHARACTER OF CROSS-EXAMINATION DEBATE .....  | 5  |
| Duties .....   | 5  |
| Admissions .....   | 6  |
| III. STRATEGY OF CROSS-EXAMINATION .....   | 8  |
| Preparation .....  | 8  |
| Technique in Questioning .....   | 9  |
| 1st rule of questioning: 'Ask little questions in a series.' .....   | 10 |
| 2nd rule of Questioning: 'Be well organized.' .....  | 10 |
| 3rd rule of Questioning: 'Be direct.' .....  | 11 |
| 4th rule of Questioning: 'Control the examination without being rude.' .....   | 12 |
| Constructing Effective Questions .....   | 13 |
| Decide what admissions you want from the witness .....   | 13 |
| Recognize that admissions fall into two principal categories: <u>admissions of fact</u> and <u>conclusions</u> ..... | 13 |
| Once you have your draft question, make it a leading question .....  | 14 |
| Add the factual basis to the question. ....  | 14 |
| Answers .....  | 14 |
| Listen to the question carefully. ....   | 15 |
| If you do not understand the question, ask for clarification .....   | 15 |
| Answer the question truthfully and as briefly as possible .....  | 15 |
| Don't make speeches .....  | 15 |
| Strategies in Answering Questions .....  | 16 |
| The examiner is wrong or mistaken .....  | 16 |
| Sometimes you can give the examiner a sought or expected answer without hurting your case .....                      | 16 |
| IV. SUMMARY .....  | 18 |
| V. THE JUDGING BALLOT .....  | 19 |
| VI. SPEAKER'S SCRIPT .....   | 20 |

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Cross-Examination debate has a flavour all its own. Debating of every type rewards those who can think on their feet, speak well and prepare thoroughly but Cross-examination debate puts special emphasis on these qualities. Debaters must answer questions immediately, without destroying their own case or aiding their opponent's. They must conceal their own damaging admissions behind a facade of indifference. And they must know their case well enough to be able to pull the most telling facts together to answer an unexpected query. In short, this style of debate highlights three vital characteristics possessed by a good debater.

### **How it differs from other styles**

Cross-Examination debating was developed in the 1920s, to accentuate the clash in debating. It differs from Parliamentary debate in two senses:

1. No formal interruptions (Points of Order, Privilege or Information) are permitted, nor (normally) is heckling; and
2. There is a period at the end of each debater's speech for questioning by an opponent.

In a sense, then, Cross-Examination debate is more a copy of the court room than of Parliament, but this comparison is misleading. The content or substance of each debate is introduced through a debater's constructive remarks, and the cross-examination period is chiefly a way of identifying differences in the two cases rather than a means of introducing information. The fact that no interruptions are permitted allows debaters to have better control over the timing of his remarks - a telling point will not be interrupted at the climax by a Point of Privilege. But the cross-examination portion of the debate forces debaters to respond to their opponent's arguments, pins him down to particular views, and exposes their own argument to a fairly searching analysis.

The rules of Cross-Examination debate differ from other debate styles only slightly:

1. No formal interruptions are permitted during the course of the debate, although at the end of the debate, an opportunity will be afforded to debaters to complain of any rule violations and misrepresentations by their opponents.

2. At the end of each debater's initial remarks (but not after the rebuttals, if separate rebuttals are permitted), that debater will be questioned by an opponent, usually for up to three or four minutes.
3. While being questioned, 'witnesses' may only answer questions; they cannot ask questions except to have confusing queries clarified. They must answer the questions themselves - neither witnesses nor 'examiners' may seek help from colleagues, although both sides may rely on source materials and books during the examination. Witnesses must answer all questions directly and honestly.
4. While asking questions, an examiner may not make statements or argue with the witness, only ask questions. Judges are instructed to disregard information introduced by an examiner while questioning and to penalize examiners for breaking the rules.
5. There are no formal rules of evidence which govern the sort of question which may be asked, though common sense dictates that the examination should be limited to fair questions on relevant subjects; however, there must be no brow-beating or attempts to belittle an opponent, and debaters must treat one another with courtesy.

Many of the conventions of Parliamentary debate are also absent - there is no proscription which prohibits calling another debater by name, and it is common practice to address opponents by their first names, especially during the course of the examination. They may also be addressed as 'witness' and 'examiner', as the case may be, but pejorative references should be avoided. Except when questioning or answering questions, one's opponents should always be referred to in the third person rather than directly. (For example: 'he told you that ...', 'the witness said ...' or 'my friend thinks ...', but not 'you told us ...' or 'you said'.)

The moderator and any other members of the audience may be addressed either directly or generally, and it is common to refer to *Ladies and Gentlemen*: "My point, ladies and gentlemen, is simply that ..." Correspondingly, teams are not the *Government* and the *Opposition*, but rather the *Affirmative* and the *Negative* (or occasionally the *Proposers* and the *Opposers*). Of course, individual members of a team may be referred to as noted above, but because there is no House, they are not *Honourable Members* but *Honourable Friends*.

The procedures prevailing during a Cross-Examination debate are much the same as those for a Parliamentary House, with a chairman moderating and introducing debaters at the beginning of their remarks (but not introducing the debater conducting a cross-examination; cross-examination follows directly on the conclusion of a constructive speech, without interruption or further introduction.) Speaking times will normally follow those that are used in Parliamentary debate, with all debaters receiving an equal amount of maximum speaking time.

*Modified\* Oxford format (two-person teams)  
(sample maximum speaking times)*

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 1st Affirmative (constructive speech) . . . . .                          | 5 minutes |
| Cross-Examination by 2nd Negative . . . . .                              | 3 minutes |
| 1st Negative (constructive speech) . . . . .                             | 5 minutes |
| Cross-Examination by 1st Affirmative) . . . . .                          | 3 minutes |
| 2nd Affirmative (constructive speech) . . . . .                          | 8 minutes |
| Cross-Examination by 1st Negative) . . . . .                             | 3 minutes |
| 2nd Negative (constructive speech) . . . . .                             | 8 minutes |
| Cross Examination by 2nd Affirmative . . . . .                           | 3 minutes |
| 1st Negative (rebuttal-defence-summary speech) . . . . .                 | 3 minutes |
| 1st Affirmative (rebuttal-defence-summary speech) . . . . .              | 3 minutes |
| Complaints of rule violations, misquotations, and so on. by either team. |           |

*\* In the ordinary Oxford rebuttal format, only the 1st Affirmative debater would have a separate rebuttal and the 1st Negative would instead receive additional time for a constructive speech. Both formats are in use in Canada.*

## II. SPECIAL CHARACTER OF CROSS-EXAMINATION DEBATE

Cross-Examination debate is in other formal respects no different from Parliamentary debate, because both have the same requirement for a clear, well-delivered speech. There are three matters where you may have to adjust your ordinary debating strategy:

1. The duties of each debater are slightly different from other styles of debate;
2. The admissions obtained during the question period must be skilfully used; and
3. Debaters must be both skilful examiners and skilful witnesses.

### A. Duties

The duties of each debater are little different from Parliamentary debate, although here the obligation to summarize the debate as well as rebut in the final three minutes is probably more pronounced. Cross-Examination is both partly by way of rebuttal and partly new material; in the final speeches you are therefore relieved from part of the burden to rebut, but have a greater need to tie together the case as a whole.

It remains the duty of the first debater for each team to outline in summary fashion the team's interpretation of the resolution and to identify those portions of the resolution on which argument will be made. The first negative debater has an obligation to respond by disputing any definitions that are unsatisfactory, and by outlining any serious challenge to the different affirmative arguments. As always, it is the duty of the second affirmative debater to respond to the important contentions of the negative. But the burden of the affirmative rebuttal falls primarily on the second speaker's main address, because the final speech for each team must be saved principally for summarizing the debate.

To a lesser degree the burden of rebuttal falls on the second negative debater, as the first negative debater's opening remarks may also be used for rebuttal.

## B. Admissions

The purpose of asking questions is to obtain admissions. While the cross-examination period forms an important part of the debate, it is wasted unless good use is made of admissions obtained.

There are two occasions to put these admissions to work:

1. ***In framing subsequent questions during the examination period and during one's constructive or rebuttal speeches.*** It is little good obtaining admissions which are then lost or forgotten. For this reason there is a special need to be flexible in presenting your prepared speech in this style of debate.
2. ***If the opposition concedes one of your vital points in response to questioning, that should be followed up in the next constructive speech*** and made use of. Failure to do so is bad technique: the judges may not appreciate the significance of your earlier line of questioning unless you tie it into your speech this way (in which case, you have simply wasted time).

Your own prepared remarks may seem beside the point or redundant (if by questioning you have already obtained the admission to prove the point you are now trying to establish); and you may allow your opponent in the next speech to retreat from or explain away a valuable admission which you have not 'nailed down' in this way.

Expect to begin your speech with words to the effect of ``*Mr. Moderator, before I begin my constructive remarks, I'd like to return to the admissions that my friend has just made under cross-examination.*``

Don't take this approach if the effect of the cross-examination was so overwhelming that you are only repeating what is already obvious; in most cases, however, you can at least summarize the success of your partner's examination period, either immediately or later in your speech.





### III. STRATEGY OF CROSS-EXAMINATION

Witnesses rarely confess to murder in court, and even more rarely in Cross-Examination debate. Your purpose as an examiner is more modest. You hope to convince the judges, not the witness, that you are correct. Your opponent whom you are examining ceases to be relevant - at least in the sense that although you are asking him questions, you do not particularly care what answer he in fact gives. If by clear questioning you paint your opponent into a corner, it does not matter that he at the last moment makes an inconsistent denial. It is enough if the judges realize that you are right as a result of the questions asked. Obviously, it will make your success more apparent if the witness admits that you are right; it is sufficient, however, if this is apparent to the audience.

This fact governs your entire strategy as witness and examiner. It means that the successful witness will never be defensive or surly: that tells the judge that the examiner is asking damaging questions and makes the judge sit up and take notice. Similarly, as an examiner, don't be frustrated when a witness denies questions which must obviously be answered 'yes'. The judge knows the correct answer to the question and he is the only one you are seeking to convince.

#### A. Preparation

The key to successful Cross-Examination debating is preparation. Your opponent has an opportunity to demonstrate to the audience that you have not prepared for the debate. Sloppy preparation may be concealed in other styles of debate; it will not escape detection here.

You must prepare the case *factually*, so that when you are asked factual questions you can respond, and so as examiner you may question (and if necessary contradict) your opponent.

You must prepare the *issues*, so that your team is in agreement before the debate on what the essential issues are and what the team's position on each is to be. In a debate on capital punishment, it is no good one debater conceding that prisons are expensive (but justifying them on other grounds) if the other is going to argue that they are economical. In a debate on unemployment, you should decide in advance - not while under questioning - what an appropriate level of unemployment is and how much you are prepared to spend to prevent unemployment from increasing beyond that level.

You must also prepare your lines of questioning and the general character of the answers you will give in advance. This will frequently grow out of your team's advance discussion of the issues in the debate. It may be that this advance preparation is in part wasted - if the debate

takes an unexpected turn. But it is difficult to frame good cross-examination questions during the heat of debate. It is similarly difficult to respond to good questions without conceding your case - and again more difficult if you are unprepared. The exact wording and sequence of questions need not always be settled in advance, but their general character should be.

*Remember to research first and to develop cross-examination questions second. To do otherwise is analogous to attempting to write a summary to an essay without having written the body. Your research completed - the evidence collected and organized into clear and concise, identifiable arguments - you will be able to proceed with a solid foundation for developing questions. A general approach is [to] ... [r]eview your research and the arguments that have developed from it. As a member of each side, determine the three or five ... issues or arguments that are weakest in the opposing side's case. Plan a series of questions to expose those areas ...*

Cooper, *Approach*, p. 2

## B. Technique in Questioning

The chief purpose of asking questions of an opponent is to rebut an opposition argument or make one of your own, but there are other important purposes, too. Your *rebuttal* purposes in cross-examination are to show that your opponents:

1. *Facts* are weak or wrong;
2. *Logic* is in error, either because:
  - (a) the facts don't support the argument, or
  - (b) the argument doesn't support the conclusion drawn;
3. *Plan* is unfeasible (in a policy debate);
4. *Assessment of benefits* are mistaken, either because:
  - (a) the benefits claimed may be challenged, or

(b) there are additional costs.

Questions may also have a *constructive* purpose - for example, to lay the groundwork for an argument you will later make (perhaps by obtaining admissions of particular facts), to obtain the details of the opposition case (so that you will have more to attack in your later speeches) or, occasionally, to make a new constructive argument directly.

Finally, the question period, particularly the first examination in the debate, is an opportunity for the negative team to show what position it will take on the important issues. By establishing the relationship between the affirmative and the negative cases at an early stage, the negative team makes it easier for the audience to understand the relevance of everything that follows.

***1st rule of questioning: 'Ask little questions in a series.'***

Questions in Cross-Examination debate are very different from those in Parliamentary debate. In Parliamentary debate, only a single question may be put, and it carries the burden (either through humour or straight refutation) of making a point. That is very difficult to do. In Cross-Examination debate, however, a whole series of questions may be asked and by seeking information a little bit at a time a much more substantial point may be made.

There is a more important reason for asking questions in a series: your purpose is to convince the audience; if you jump around, you may lose them. By asking questions in a series you let the audience follow your line of thought and understand the purpose of the questions. You allow the judges to recognize your ability to think logically. And by focusing on three or four important lines of questioning, you signal to the judge that you can distinguish between important and trivial matters.

You should break each line of questioning into individual questions in which you seek to make only one point per question. And you should normally have between three and ten questions in a given line of questioning. (If your purpose is *constructive* - for example, to obtain plan details or to show the relationship between the affirmative and the negative case - one or two questions may be enough. Only in your *rebuttal* use of questions is three-to-ten-in-a-series a useful rule of thumb.)

***2nd rule of Questioning: 'Be well organized.'***

Occasionally, your questions will be intended to elicit admissions which can be used later in your speech (the *constructive* purpose spoken of above). If so, the point of the questions may not be obvious to the

judges - not until you make use of the admissions in your constructive remarks. For the most part, however, you are trying to make an immediate point to the judges. Not only do you serve your purpose by asking questions in a series, but you also make it easier for the judges by asking organized questions which play on one topic for a time and then move on to something else.

As a rule of thumb, spend only about a minute on each line of questioning you pursue. To be most effective, you should choose your lines of questioning while listening to your opponent's speech. (You will have brought several possible lines of questioning with you to the debate; which you use, or whether you construct a new series of questions on the spot, is a decision to make while listening to your opponent.)

While it is good technique to use your question period to gain admissions that you can later use in your own constructive remarks, your questions will be more effective if the majority of them are directly relevant to the speech that just concluded. As with rebuttal, you may plan certain lines of questioning in advance, but if their purpose is merely to rebut an argument - rather than to establish one of your own - *you cannot use them if your opponent does not make that argument*. In choosing which lines of questioning to use, keep two considerations in mind: if you run out of time, you must have already covered the most important areas of your examination - so put them first. On the other hand, you want to end on a strong note - since much of your strategy is creating the impression of success, rather than obtaining any particular admission from the witness. So you may decide that you should stop early - rather than commence a line of questioning that you will not be able to see through to its conclusion.

### ***3rd rule of Questioning: 'Be direct.'***

Ask focussed, leading questions, not vague, open-ended questions.

When a lawyer says to his client, *'You were travelling only about 30 miles an hour when you had the accident, weren't you?'*, he 'leads' his client to the answer he wants - a different answer, perhaps, than he would get if he asked, *'Did you notice how fast you were going?'* or *'How fast were you going when you had the accident?'*

In Cross-Examination debate, you should always ask leading questions - not because they show the witness what answer you want (although that is important) but because they show the judges what answer you want.

Do not ask *'What do you think ...'* or *'How do you explain ...'* Such questions invite an answer of book length and are not focussed.

Instead, invert the question and supply the answer you want the witness to reach: *'You think ..., don't you?'* This often forces a 'yes' or 'no' answer (and even if it does not, it narrows the issue greatly), it makes the issues clear for the judges, it leaves you in control of the examination, and it tells the judges exactly what the purpose of your question is. It follows from this that the best form of question is normally one which is short and contains a statement that you want to put to the witness. So, in a debate on free university tuition, don't ask *'What proportion of a student's income is spent on tuition?'*; rather turn the question around and ask, *'An average student spends about 25% of his income on tuition, isn't that so?'*

***4th rule of Questioning: 'Control the examination without being rude.'***

Nothing looks worse than an examiner who is ripping into a witness - the audience immediately feels sorry for the witness.

Your strategy is directed towards winning the sympathy of the audience; to do that you may have to be tough, but you must always seem fair. You must never make your audience sympathize with the witness. Similarly, you must not try to choke off an apparently damaging answer - because the judges will conclude (whether the answer is damaging or not) that some facts are against you and you are trying to cover up your weak position.

The only time you can interrupt an answer without alienating the judges is when it is clearly irrelevant, and often then only after a long series of irrelevant answers. If the witness avoids answering a question, ask it again, if possible in exactly the same words. This is an effective way of underlining the witness's evasion.

Be polite, however: asking leading questions as suggested above will give the audience the impression that you are being tough with the witness. If this is accompanied by any intimidation by voice or gesture, you are likely to lose the sympathies of the audience. For the same reason, don't demand a particular answer of the witness: your goal is to convince the audience, not the witness. Even when you do not get exactly what you want, if the audience realizes that the witness is equivocating, you obtain the same measure of success. And it may be that your argument can be made with what the witness gives.

During the examination period, you may only ask questions of the witness - not make statements - so you are certain to lose any 'argument' with the witness. The witness can reply and you cannot, unless you break the rules, so save any dispute until your team's next constructive speech. At that time, quote the source that shows the facts that your opponent disputed or was unaware of; observe that you feel

confident your opponent is acting in good faith and that the mistake (in getting the fact wrong) was a research oversight; invite the witness (along with the audience), now in possession of *all the facts*, to share your inevitable conclusion. *Your opponent cannot answer back during your constructive speech, so this type of reply can be given much more effectively here.*

During the examination period, itself, however, you must demonstrate that you are in control. When you have the answer you want, or when the witness begins to stray from the topic or ask questions, refocus on the subject tactfully and try another tack: *'Thank you, witness, that answers the question'* or *'Perhaps we can get to that later; all I asked now was ...'* or *'It's my role to ask the questions now, thank you.'* To disarm the witness and make a favorable impression with the audience, it is often wise to begin with neutral questions and move from the general to the specific.

### C. Constructing Effective Questions

It is quite easy to construct effective questions, once you are armed with the foregoing advice. Let us consider the steps to follow.

1. ***Decide what admissions you want from the witness.*** What is the purpose of the questioning? The easiest way to write questions is to start backwards: decide what you would like your opponent to admit (be reasonable!) and devise questions that will elicit that admission. As a negative debater in a debate on 'Increasing police powers', you may decide you want the following admissions: (1) The public generally (and police officers in particular) are not in greater danger now than in the past; and (2) The public needs to be protected from the police, too (and so, you imply, we should not increase police powers).
2. ***Recognize that admissions fall into two principal categories: admissions of fact and conclusions.*** Normally you will ask a series of factual questions designed to produce a conclusion. Start with knowing what conclusion you want the audience to draw, attempt to break that conclusion into a series of factual statements that lead to it. In the example above, *'Has the crime rate increased or decreased since 1980?'* and *'Has the number of assaults against police officers increased or decreased since 1980?'* are two factual questions that might lead to the conclusion that you want (that the danger now is no greater than in the past).

3. **Once you have your draft question, make it a leading question.** This ensures that it implies the answer that you want and is normally accomplished by inverting it. The questions in the example above become, *'The rate of violent crime has declined since 1980, hasn't it?'* and *'The number of assaults against police officers has declined in the same period, hasn't it?'*
4. **Add the factual basis to the question.** It is not enough to imply the answer; your question should also have the content that makes it indisputable. In the two examples above, the questions, although leading, might still produce an unsatisfactory or disputed answer. They should be proved. *'In 1983, the rate of violent crime declined from 14 incidents per thousand population to 9 incidents per thousand, didn't it?'* and *'In the same period, assaults against police officers declined from 312 to 249 across Canada, didn't they?'*

You now have your cross-examination questions. They may benefit from editing and polishing (and they may identify for you areas of your own case that require further research) but you should now be a strong cross-examiner.

Of course, what specific questions you ask is very much a result of the particular debate resolution, the side you are on, and the position your team takes on the several issues in the debate. Because the examiner may only ask questions, it is very difficult to cross-examine on abstract issues (which, in any event, should be avoided in a debate). The possibility of error or police abuses in the present system is vague; the case of Donald Marshall is concrete. The crime rate is vague; the case of Paul Bernardo is specific. If abstract issues are to be dealt with, they should be illustrated with concrete examples, analogies or particular instances.

## D. Answers

Your objective as witness is the same as your objective as examiner: to create a favourable impression with the audience. To do that, you should appear cooperative and helpful. You should not become defensive (which suggests that you are making damaging admissions). And you should not stall - this signals that you do not know the answer, that it is damaging or that you are unprepared. Answering a question with a question reveals a poor knowledge of the rules. You want to convince the audience that you are forthright, well prepared and correct in your views; you don't want to alienate them through bad manners. In particular, if a question has trapped you, be as nonchalant and pleasant



as possible - the judges may miss (or misunderstand) the effect of the admission you are forced to make. Further, such an attitude may bluff the opposing debater into thinking the admission unimportant or also to your advantage.

The first step to being a good witness is to be well prepared. It is fundamental to our craft as debaters that for every argument (or authority) there is an equal and opposite argument (or authority). Your success as a witness depends in part on your having located that 'reply' and being able to produce it quickly. Cue cards with the necessary information readily at hand may prove invaluable in the height of cross-examination when time is precious. (The rules prohibit you from consulting your partner while under examination.) Of course, if you are well prepared, you will understand the issues; when the examiner asks a question, you should be able quickly to grasp the issue being raised and be prepared for the opportunity to present the 'reply' - that opposite argument or authority that your research has produced to support your conclusion.

Your job as a witness breaks down into four steps:

1. ***Listen to the question carefully.*** Be certain that you understand what is being sought before you attempt an answer, but don't stall;
2. ***If you do not understand the question, ask for clarification;*** if the question is really several questions, ask the examiner which one he wants answered;
3. ***Answer the question truthfully and as briefly as possible.*** Long answers always look evasive and may create a bad impression with the judges. Worse, a long answer uses up the examination period - and the best impression you can create comes when you answer 'all of the questions your opponent could possibly have' and still have time left over. A long answer is also more likely to contain information damaging to your case than a short one.
4. ***Don't make speeches,*** and don't declare to the audience 'I know where you are going with that line of questioning!' Far better that you should (apparently without trying) turn the questions to your own advantage.

## E. Strategies in Answering Questions

In answering questions, you must of course tell the truth and be (and convey the impression of being) forthright; but you can do so within the limits of the following. You have two possible approaches:

1. ***The examiner is wrong or mistaken*** - and so you give an unwanted or unexpected answer. *You disagree*. If this is to succeed, you should have at hand sufficient information or reasoning to make it clear why your answer is correct and not merely an evasion.
2. ***Sometimes you can give the examiner a sought or expected answer without hurting your case***. This can be very effective. For example, it may be that:
  - (a) the logic or premise on which the questions are based is wrong; even if you answer all of the questions the way the examiner wishes, that may not prove the conclusion. (For example, even if you admit there have been a number of recent, sensational police killings, that does not show that the rate of violent crime is generally increasing.)
  - (b) the answers you give do support the conclusion your examiner wishes to draw, but that conclusion itself does not prove the case as a whole. (An admission that there are a lot of abuses under the existing parole system does not demand a return to Capital Punishment; rather it may indicate the need for parole reform.)
  - (c) many of the answers you give are ones your examiner seeks, but to crucial questions you give unwanted or unexpected answers. You may give the answers your opponent seeks, without hurting your case. (Even if you admit that 40% of car accidents are 'alcohol-related', that statistic does not mean that 60% of those who drink-and-drive don't have accidents; it means that of all drivers - both those who have been drinking and those who haven't been - a disproportionate percentage of the total accidents are caused by those who drink and drive.
  - (d) the answers you give do support the case of the examiner, but it may be that the evidence as a whole is against it. (An admission that incarceration is more expensive than capital punishment doesn't end the debate on the death penalty!)

Whichever approach you take - and the approach may well be different for different lines of questioning - it will be necessary to make clear to the judges why the conclusion the examiner wants does not follow from the answers you have given.

The next debater on your team should begin by referring to the two most recent cross-examination periods - in which your team answered questions and in which your team questioned an opponent. The purpose of doing so is to explain away any apparently damaging answers you may have given, and to highlight the damaging effect of the answers your opponent has just given:

*"Before I begin my constructive remarks, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to say a brief word about the two cross-examinations just concluded. Under examination, my opponent admitted that the crime rate has declined over the last three years, while at the same time, complaints against the police have increased. This reinforces our belief that there is no present need for an increase in police powers. At the same time, you will recall that when my colleague was cross-examined, he admitted that protection of the public is the reason for a police force, and that a police force is vital to the protection of society. But these questions show that the affirmative team has missed the point of the debate: we are not suggesting that the police force be disbanded - of course we need a police force. The real question is whether we need a more powerful police force at a time when crime is declining and there are many objections to the existing police powers ..."*

However you answer the questions put to you, it is best to be forthright and cooperative and so to create a favourable impression with the judges. If the examiner is mistaken, show later why the questions don't make sense or don't justify the conclusion being drawn. If the question requires an extended answer, ask for permission to give an extended answer; if the examiner refuses, you win the point in the minds of the judges; if the examiner consents, there is no valid complaint that you are taking too long. (For example, you might say: *'There are four reasons why we believe that. Do you want me to explain them?'*)

## **IV. SUMMARY**

Although the cross-examination period forms only a small part of the debate, it offers an opportunity to make your entire argument more effectively and to display your superior research, questioning and planning skills. This opportunity should not be missed.

## V. THE JUDGING BALLOT

The Ballot has a separate category in which to evaluate Debate Skills - the ability (as a questioner) to elicit admissions, avoid speech-making, ask a series of fair, relevant, precisely phrased questions and (as a witness) to refrain from asking questions but instead give honest answers that are resourceful rather than evasive and expose the fallacies in the questions asked while respecting the examiner's right to control the examination. Your courtesy, both as examiner and witness, will also be considered.

| <b>Newfoundland and Labrador Speech and Debate Union<br/>Cross-Examination Ballot</b>  |            |                |                |                           |            |                |                |
|--|------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Resolution:</b>   |            |                |                |                           |            |                |                |
| <b>Judge:</b>  |            |                |                | <b>Room:</b>              |            | <b>Round:</b>  |                |
| <b>Affirmative Team:</b>   |            |                |                | <b>Negative Team:</b>     |            |                |                |
| <b>First Aff:</b>  |            |                |                | <b>First Neg:</b>         |            |                |                |
| <b>Second Aff:</b>   |            |                |                | <b>Second Neg:</b>        |            |                |                |
| <b>Category</b>  | <b>Pts</b> | <b>1st Aff</b> | <b>2nd Aff</b> | <b>Category</b>           | <b>Pts</b> | <b>1st Neg</b> | <b>2nd Neg</b> |
| Content and Evidence   | 20         |                |                | Content and Evidence      | 20         |                |                |
| Argument and Evidence  | 10         |                |                | Argument and Evidence     | 10         |                |                |
| Witness  | 15         |                |                | Witness                   | 15         |                |                |
| Examiner   | 15         |                |                | Examiner                  | 15         |                |                |
| Organization   | 10         |                |                | Organization              | 10         |                |                |
| Refutation and Rebuttal  | 10         |                |                | Refutation and Rebuttal   | 10         |                |                |
| Presentation and Delivery  | 20         |                |                | Presentation and Delivery | 20         |                |                |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>100</b> |                |                | <b>Total</b>              | <b>100</b> |                |                |
| <b>Team Total</b>  |            |                |                | <b>Team Total</b>         |            |                |                |
| <p style="text-align: center;">In my opinion the debate was won by the: <b>AFFIRMATIVE / NEGATIVE</b></p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">The team with the higher score will be awarded the win.<br/>We will assume that the overall score is the mark that you intend to give. If that is not the case and you would prefer that we use the correct sum of the categories (in the event that the two are not the same) please check here: _____</p> |            |                |                |                           |            |                |                |
| <b>Judge's Comments</b>  |            |                |                |                           |            |                |                |
| 1st Affirmative  |            |                |                | 1st Negative              |            |                |                |
| 2nd Affirmative  |            |                |                | 2nd Negative              |            |                |                |
| <small>Newfoundland and Labrador Speech and Debate Union<br/>Site: <a href="http://NLSDU.COM">NLSDU.COM</a> E-mail: <a href="mailto:info@NLSDU.COM">info@NLSDU.COM</a> </small>  |            |                |                |                           |            |                |                |

## **VI. SPEAKER'S SCRIPT**