

LPF Speaking Exemplar

Hong Kong Should Allow Mercy Killing 1 (First Speaker of the Opposition Team)

Task Description

Students worked in groups of six and were divided into the proposition team and the opposition team. They formulated arguments in support of their position and took part in a debate on the motion, 'Hong Kong should allow mercy killing'.

Preparation

Before carrying out the debate, students participated in a range of activities, building the skills necessary for debating such as defining motions, researching information, analysing underlying principles and assumptions, working out arguments and examples, structuring arguments, preparing speeches, and using appropriate delivery techniques for enhancing the transition between team members in a debate.

Learning Outcomes: ATMs 6-7

The following annotations illustrate the learning outcomes of the first speaker of the opposition team who introduced the motion and the stance of the team in a debate.

Content, Organisation & Communication Strategies	Language	Pronunciation, Stress, Rhythm & Intonation
ATM7 Organising, presenting and exchanging information, ideas, personal experiences and opinions on familiar and less familiar topics with some elaboration clearly, and using a range of communication strategies	ATM6 Using a range of language forms and functions quite appropriately and accurately	ATM7 Speaking English accurately and fluently, and with generally appropriate stress, rhythm and intonation
<p>The student can</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • play the role of the first speaker of the opposition team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - by introducing and rejecting the motion, e.g. ‘On behalf of the first speaker of the opposition team, I would like to express our rejection on the motion that Hong Kong should allow mercy killing.’ - by presenting opposing arguments with supporting evidence that appeals to existing rules or laws, e.g. ‘...by the Declaration of Human Rights,...everyone has the right to live.’ - by introducing team 	<p>The student can</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use a range of vocabulary and expressions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to introduce opposition team’s argument, e.g. ‘Declaration of Human Rights’, ‘control one’s life and death’, ‘doctors’, ‘professionalism’, ‘support and encouragement’ - to outline the opposing arguments for the team and introduce what the team members will be talking about, e.g. ‘...I’m going to speak about...’, ‘Our second speaker, Helen, is going to further elaborate...’, ‘And for our third speaker, Josephine will be talking about...and she’ll also be emphasising...’, ‘So mercy killing should not be allowed and today’s motion must not 	<p>The student can</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pronounce most words and expressions related to the arguments against mercy killing accurately, e.g. ‘Declaration of Human Rights’, ‘mercy killing’, ‘control patients’ lives’, ‘doctors’, ‘professionalism to judge’, ‘should always be optimistic about the future’ • produce long utterances with generally appropriate stress, rhythm and intonation, e.g. ‘I’m going to speak about the basic reason why mercy killing is incorrect and why mercy killing should not be allowed in Hong Kong.’, ‘By the way, the above point is very important for today’s motion because we are considering whether

<p>members, e.g. ‘Our second speaker, Helen, is going to further elaborate...’, ‘...our third speaker, Josephine, will be talking about...’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> organise her speech clearly with an introduction of the motion, disagreements of definition, the use of refutations and the introduction of team members, e.g. ‘...I would like to express our rejection on the motion that...’, ‘...by the Declaration of Human Rights, ...everyone has the right to live....’, ‘You may suggest that doctors have the professionalism to judge... but doctors may become the murderer...’, ‘Our second speaker, Helen, is going to...our third speaker, Josephine, will be talking about...’ respond to the motion through giving some evaluative comments on the value of life, e.g. ‘It is definitely not worthwhile to end one’s life because life is more important than anything. 	<p>stand. Thank you.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> use parallel structures to add force to an argument of why mercy killing is not justified, e.g. ‘We don’t have the right to end one’s life. We do not have the absolute power to control one’s life and death.’ use clauses of contrast to present counter-arguments, e.g. ‘Even though doctors have the professionalism, they’re still human beings.’, ‘...doctors have the professionalism to judge and the relatives to agree, but doctors may become the murderer since patients are still living.’ use conditionals to talk about a potential problem, e.g. ‘If doctors decide to carry out mercy killing on the patient, moral problems may arise.’ 	<p>doctors should have the right to control patients’ lives.’</p>
---	---	---

<p>So mercy killing should not be allowed and today's motion must not stand.'</p>		
---	--	--

Transcription

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of the first speaker of the opposition team, I would like to express our rejection on the motion that Hong Kong should allow mercy killing. I'm going to speak about the basic reason why mercy killing is incorrect and why mercy killing should not be allowed in Hong Kong. Firstly, by the Declaration of Human Rights, which is accepted by most of the people, everyone has the right to live. We don't have the right to end one's life. We do not have the absolute power to control one's life and death. Also, allowing mercy killing is an alternative of supporting a person to commit suicide. Why do I say so? It's because the person who wants the doctor offer him mercy killing is actually killing himself or herself through another person. Therefore, it is definitely not worth taking. By the way, the above point is very important for today's motion because we are considering whether doctors should have the right to control patients' lives. The power of one's life and death depends on a doctor. Even though doctors have the professionalism, they're still human beings. They still don't have the right to control one's life. If doctors decide to carry out mercy killing on the patient, moral problems may arise. You may suggest that doctors have the professionalism to judge and the relatives to agree, but doctors may become the murderer since patients are still living. We also shouldn't forget that doctors are here to give patient support and encouragement. They should always be optimistic about the future, giving confidence to the patients. Our second speaker, Helen, is going to further elaborate the point and support our arguments by live examples. And for our third speaker, Josephine, will be talking about why mercy killing is not worthy and she'll also be emphasising how Chinese think of mercy killing and the traditional and culture thoughts towards such act. Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you all understand the value of life. It is definitely not worthwhile to end one's life because life is more important than anything. So mercy killing should not be allowed and today's motion must not stand. Thank you.

(Copyrights reserved by **Education Bureau**)