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Hello, everyone.Today's topic is using private homes as hotel for student school trips should be banned. We define the motion as follows. Only elementary students study in Japan. And their teacher and their parents don't stay at private homes with the elementary students. [inaudible] this up. And we have two points. The first point is that it is dangerous for staying students. The second point is they are--Immature.--immature.

I will explain the first points that it is danger for staying students. First, private homes is different service and safety. For examples, one company [build?] itself a private homes for visitors and I heard their service is good. However, one private homes provide food which has food poison in [inaudible] and don't know allergy foods. And the visitor--Why can't you say, "Only a private home has the poison food or something?Well--Why only private homes has poisonous food? [inaudible].Oh, okay. No, sorry. Next speakers answers. Come in now. And the visitors ate it then and he was sent from a hospital and it [inaudible] at the newspapers. And so provide homes that's good and should check the private homes is[Point?]?--no secure? Good or bad. And so it is a problem for students and teachers. And recently, private homes are bad. So the government makes a law of private homes--Point.No, thank you.[inaudible].[inaudible]. Homes and [inaudible]. So the law, it can't make perfect.[Sir?]?No, thank you. And so that's the problem. It is dangerous too. So my problem is the school and the teacher should think about the teachers' and students' safety. And therefore using private homes as hotel for school trips should be banned. Thank you.

Okay. So what is school trip? School is where students can learn something that they can't learn at school. Through [this?] field trip, they can actually see with their own eyes, own ears and communicate with local people, interact with local people, and that is the point of school trip. So now I want to move on through the verification and get it to the Prime Minister of the government side. So he mentioned that it's very dangerous for elementary students to stay at private homes. However, there's no uniqueness to the private homes. Since there is some person has accident or crimes at hotels as well. And also, if it's that dangerous for students, then why would you limit to elementary students? And also, if we can solve this by alternative ways such as give then criteria or license or a test for private homes same as the hotels.

Now, I will like to move on to my point. So our [team stance?] today is diverse experience. So now, we have two points. First one is comprehensive experience and second point is experience countryside. So now I will like to talk about the first point. So there are things that they can only experience at private homes. So for example, they can communicate and interact with local people only in private homes. For example, they can learn how they spend their night, for example, the dinner, what they eat. Or in city like us, we spend night by studying or using our phones. However, local people might be different from them, right? And you can learn that only through staying private homes. However, if you stay at hotels, they can't learn these different culture or diverse culture. And these students can create their own world by using smartphone or talking something in their community which is no difference from their usual life, right?And therefore, the educational intent of school trip cannot be achieved by school trip which has no meaning of the private school. Therefore, we believe that if we take this motion, these students cannot learn much from the school trip which school's intend students to be learning. So, therefore, we believe that it is very educational crisis because school trip is very important for students to learn and experience something new through their eyes and their own ears. However, by taking this motion, these students cannot experience new things. Thank you.

We believe that using private home as hotels for student should be banned. Let me rebut a [official's?] first point. They say they can't learn a lot of things in the school. However, it has not private school-- if it was not private home, they can't communicate to local people. For example, talking something or asking something, it is very meaningful. Therefore, using private school--Home.--as homes for school trips should be banned.

Next, let me deconstruct government's first point. They said they have license. However, private homes are not safe enough because it has [land?] and managed by individual. But hotels are not. So hotels are more safe. Therefore using private homes as hotels for school trips should be banned.

Then, let me explain our second point. They are too immature. We believe that they have not grown up. They have not grown up enough. So they can't take responsibility their own powers. There are no teacher and their parents. If it was hotel, they can tell what happened for them to their teacher.Point of information is in the age of smartphones, why can't they report to their teacher using their phone or simply call the police if something bad happens?So if the students don't have a smartphone, they can't contact with their teacher. Also, they don't have enough communication ability. For example, their friend was bad. However, they can't tell you about it enough. After school trip, if they were harmed, they was very, heavy sick. And who have responsibility if they are too immature to use private house as a hotels for school trip. Therefore, using private homes as hotels school trips should be banned. Thank you.

School trips exist to expose students that the world exists outside of their narrow perspective, right? When you're in an urban school, you go to see rural areas because there's another world out there. And they provide that invaluable opportunity. With that said, our stance for today was diverse experience. And I'm going to be talking about how students have to experience the countryside. But before that, some [inaudible]. First, towards the first speaker. They talked about how it's dangerous, right? We told you that we would hold these homes to the same standard as hotels, therefore, maximizing safety.Also, it's not unique to private homes. Hotels have the same danger. Towards their refute towards first about alternatives, they have not refuted that private homes are-- to our fact that private homes are a comprehensive experience, right? They haven't told us how field work will allow students to learn about climate, the culture, the architecture. All of those things you can only gain by actually living in the same style of the local person. We think that's a unique benefit to our side.

Now, to their first point-- to their second point about immaturity, we think that there is a very low possibility of danger because their interests are aligned for both private homes and for students, right? The private homes are being paid to protect these students. Therefore, they're going to maximize their effort to do that. And the students want to stay safe as well, right? We think that as long as these interests are aligned, these homeowners will do everything in their power to keep students safe. And we think that because it has worked so well in the past for Japanese schools, it will work well in the future. And because they haven't given us any examples, we don't have sufficient reason to believe it will be bad.

Moving on to my point about how experiencing countryside is important. Banning private homes would limit school trips to cities and narrow student perspective. In the sphere of scope, private homes are used for trips to rural areas without hotels, right? For example, in Shibu, Shibu students go to a very small city-- not a city, very small village in Kyushu to live with a farmer and learn about the effort behind making rice because that is an experience that you cannot get in the middle of Shibuya. And without that experience, we would grow up without knowing how difficult it is to make one piece of rice. That experience shapes our worldview and makes us believe that rural places are important.However, in their after plan, schools can only go to cities with hotels so like Tokyo and Osaka, right? There's going to be no more trips to the little villages in Kyushu. As a result, students cannot learn about rural areas. And we think that it's especially important to do this in the elementary school age because we need to create this basis of knowledge in their minds that rural places. They do important work like agriculture.We think that this leads to two detrimental effects. First, it alienates rural areas especially in urban students like us. When these students later become politicians or business owners, they're going to make decisions that only benefit urban places because they don't know about rural places. This is especially bad when Japanese rural areas are already in decline. Right? It's especially that.Second, it eliminates income for rural families who rely on this business to keep them alive when they're not farming, for example. We think that in the end, it's going to be neglecting the majority of the population who live in rural areas. And it's going to suffocate the already-suffering rural areas of Japan. Thank you.

Oh, sorry. Okay. So our two stance for today was diverse experience and first point was comprehensive experience and the second point was, what?Experience countryside.Experience the countryside. And so today I have one question which was unique issue. So opposition side has-- oh, sorry. The woman's side mention about the dangerous and immaturity. So we prove that their government side issue was not unique to only private homes because this issue is already happening in hotels. And by giving them enough lessons or criteria to private school, so it's kind of proven. So this problem is not unique. And immaturity, as my second speaker has said, between student private school-- oh sorry, private homes, there is mutual contract. So private homes are already paid to be responsible to their student. So this problem won't being happen.So second one on our point, we proved that the experience of school trips can give student a very precious experience because the experience of local is only they can experience as the local area. And a school trip is that. And this can be achieved only by interacting with local people especially by knowing local lifestyle. So as my first speaker has said, communicating and listening to local story with the people of private homes-- so on this point, what we said is only we can experience staying at a private homes. That why we want to say we don't want take this motion. Thank you.

Hello everyone.We believe that using private homes as hotels for school trips should be banned. First, let me rebut the opposition second point. They said a student can learn a lot of things through spend time rural area. However, they don't have to have good experience like the school trip. They can learn about that when they become adult or they can go there with their parents. Therefore, private homes as hotels for school trip should be banned.

Then, I will summarize today debates. The most important point is using private home as hotels for school trip can make a lot of serious problems and even make for some children and people of this come endangered. On this point, the idea is school trips' purpose is to learn communication and food and so on at private home. Sorry. And hotel can be dangerous as well. However, our argument is superior. It is because using private homes as hotels for school trip can be bad for both elementary student and people who run their home as hotels.Point. How do children get the unique countryside experience only going to large cities in school trips?I will talk about later. First of all, for students, it must be dangerous. Even they don't know the dangers. And the danger at the hotel must be much fewer. The law for using private homes as schools is not enough. You said that private homes get licenses, but one website has 50% more private homes which don't have license. Government don't decide to punish this private home. And you said it's the kind of learning. That's true. But the benefit is much fewer than the safe. The children's safety is the most important thing. And their experience can be did after they becoming adult and they can go with parents. And therefore, using private homes as hotels for school trip should be banned. Thank you.