

LPF Speaking Exemplar

Hong Kong Should Allow Mercy Killing 2 (Second Speaker of the Proposition 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 7-8

The following annotations illustrate the learning outcomes of the second speaker of the proposition team who refuted the opposition team's arguments, reinforced his team's stance and put forward his own arguments in a debate.

Content, Organisation & Communication Strategies	Language	Pronunciation, Stress, Rhythm & Intonation
<p>ATM8 Organising, presenting and exchanging information, ideas, personal experiences and opinions on familiar and less familiar topics with elaboration clearly, and using a range of communication strategies to achieve desired effects</p>	<p>ATM8 Using a wide range of language forms and functions generally appropriately and accurately</p>	<p>ATM7 Speaking English accurately and fluently, and with generally appropriate stress, rhythm and intonation</p>
<p>The student can</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • play the role of the second speaker of the proposition team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - by refuting opposing points of view with justification, e.g. ‘... let me make a rebuttal on what the first speaker of the opposition side has said...mercy killing, in other words is a suicide but she clearly didn’t hear what my first speaker had said. Suicide has no approvals of doctors or families while in mercy killing, there is.’ • organise his pro-argument clearly 	<p>The student can</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use well-chosen vocabulary and expressions to describe the suffering of terminal patients, e.g. ‘a horrific future ahead of them’, ‘in a delirious and incapable state’, ‘terminal diseases’, ‘incurable diseases’ • use parallel structures to add force to the argument about the horrific future faced by terminal patients, e.g. ‘the gradual decline of their body, the failure of their organs, and the need for artificial support’ • use rhetorical questions to get the audience to support his argument for mercy 	<p>The student can</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pronounce familiar and unfamiliar words related to the arguments for mercy killing accurately, e.g. ‘make a rebuttal’, ‘right to live’, ‘right to die’, ‘choice’, ‘terminal diseases’, ‘horrific future’, ‘suffer in’, ‘delirious’, ‘miserable world’, ‘painkillers’, ‘relieve’ • produce long utterances with generally appropriate stress, rhythm and intonation, e.g. ‘Those who are in the late stages of terminal diseases have a horrific future ahead of them: the gradual decline of their body, the failure of their organs, and the need for artificial support.’, ‘Also, we

<p>with substantial elaboration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - describe how terminal patients suffer with, e.g. ‘Those who are in the late stages of terminal diseases have a horrific future ahead of them: the gradual decline of their body, the failure of their organs, and the need for artificial support.’ • respond to the opponent’s question, add spontaneous remarks and make clarification, e.g. ‘But I think you have misunderstood what I have said...This is my answer to the question.’ • recapitulate the main argument in the conclusion, e.g. ‘Now, to conclude my speech...we don’t want to see patients...to suffer in this world...’ 	<p>killing, e.g. ‘Why can’t we have the right to die?’, ‘Do you want a patient who have a terminal disease to suffer in this miserable world, taking painkillers or medicine every hour of the day but knowing that he or she would drop dead any second?’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • structure the speech with the use of sign-posting to help audience concentrate on the flow of the speech, e.g. ‘As my captain has said, I’ll now focus on...’, ‘...first, let me make a rebuttal on...’, ‘Now, let’s move on to ...’, ‘Let me further elaborate now...’, ‘Now, to conclude my speech,...’ 	<p>don’t want to see patients who have incurable disease to suffer in this world, taking painkillers, and medicine every hour of the day.’</p>
---	--	--

Transcription

S: Student

S1: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. As my captain has said, I'll now focus on human rights and terminal diseases. But first, let me make a rebuttal on what the first speaker of the opposition side has said in her speech. She said that mercy killing, in other words, is a suicide but she clearly didn't hear what my first speaker had said. Suicide has no approvals of doctors or families while in mercy killing, there is. Now, every human being has a right to live as the opposition side's first speaker has said. It is the most basic and fundamental of our all our right. We have a right to live and a right to die. It is our choice. We have a right to breathe, to walk on earth, to look, to think, etc. Why can't we have the right to die? Remember, mercy killing is based on the individual or the patient. It is not forced by anyone. Who would give up their lives so easily? Of course, no one. Now, let's move on to terminal diseases. Those who are in the late stages of terminal diseases have a horrific future ahead of them: the gradual decline of their body, the failure of their organs, and the need for artificial support. Even if this is not the case, the huge amount of medi... medication required to control their pain will often leave them in a delirious and incapable state.

S2: A point of information.

S1: Yes.

S2: Do you mean that taking drugs to relieve their pain is a suffering? I don't think so.

S1: Yes, thank you very much for your point of information. But I think you have misunderstood what I have said. Let me further elaborate now...um...to tell you what I think...what my whole team thinks. Everyone, close your eyes and think of much more deeper level. What is the point of living in this world if you have to take painkillers or medicine every minute, every hour of the day? Remember, they are patients with incurable diseases using painkillers to relieve their pain. This is my answer to the question. There is no point, no point at all to live in this world. Now, I would like the opposition side to answer me in their next speech. Do you want a patient who have a terminal disease to suffer in this miserable world, taking painkillers or medicine every hour of the day but knowing that he or she would drop dead any second? I look forward to your full interpretation to...to my to the...to my question. Now, to conclude my speech, it is a human right to die with the person's own choice, not forced, of course. Also, we don't want to see patients who have incurable disease to suffer in this world, taking painkillers, and medicine every hour of the day. So this motion, with no doubt, that 'Hong Kong Should Allow Mercy Killing' must stand. Thank you.