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Hello, everyone. My name is [Ika?]. Using private home undermines the budget of school trip and does create risk. We have two points. First of all, students risk will be reduced. [inaudible] more meaningful school trips.

I'll explain our first point. Our first point is student risk will be reduced. Lots of school use private home for school trips, right? However, this situation becomes less safe-- no safety. We have two examples. First of all, hotel must ask whether students have [inaudible] or not. However, private home have a risk, too, for get us to students [inaudible], or house, or [inaudible] something like that. And second example of hotel have security to protect students, or customers. However, please imagine private homes don't have enough to protect the student, right? Because private homes have not-- don't have a provision of position to care of the students, right? And for this reason, children will more dangerous situation will be the private homes.And also, this is a bad situation because these children can get easily to damage from the [inaudible] and the school is the-- school trip is [inaudible] schools, right? And so this means teachers or people must protect students. However, private homes cannot protect-- cannot enough to protect. This is [inaudible] is not enough importance to them. And so we should cover this situation not about [inaudible]. We should take this motion. And also I explain our process. First of all, school trip is a part of school, right? And the second of all, if children goes to private homes, these children risk will increase because their support is not enough support of students. And so it's possible their risk will increase, and the children's safety will increase through this situation. And then we should take this motion to more safety, more make safety situation for the children on the school trip, and the situation ensure the student's safety.

Hello, everyone. I disagree with this motion using private homes as hotels for school trips should be banned. [inaudible] is not safety for students to stay at homes [inaudible] which I think we can communicate. Sorry.  I think we need to communicate with people in the school trips. And so we can communicate with people who lent their homes as hotels [inaudible] staying at the hotels. Surely it will [inaudible] but if-- sorry. [inaudible] can't do anything. So [inaudible].

Our second point-- we have three points. The first point is the country can be [inaudible]. And second point is students and their families have [inaudible]. I'll explain the first point. The first point-- sorry. Hotels [inaudible] which [inaudible] also people can get many monies. It is easy. But I can [inaudible]. Oh, sorry. Such as Tokyo, which has [inaudible] the government's [inaudible] compare with Tokyo's. [inaudible] the country empathize a lot of people. [inaudible] built for [inaudible]. It is difficult for us to empathize all over the world. Using private homes as hotels for school trips is very big chance to empathize for the country such as hotels. So I disagree with this motion. Thank you.

Okay. Hello, let me start my speech. Using private homes undermines the value of school trips and just creates risk. Okay, our first point was students' risk will increase-- will be reduced. Because let me reconstruct this point. They said that they can communicate so there will be no risk. However, obviously not because as our first speaker said, for example, a professional knows we have to ask if the student has the allergy or not. However, if you just have professional knowledge maybe you will forget to ask if they have allergies, and if we can eat that. And they'll eat that and then they'll be damaged. Or the people in the private homes actually have some bad thoughts to the child, and in order to like kidnap him or do bad things to him, they try to get him into their private homes. We can say these risks will surely exist. Therefore, we can say it is very dangerous, and the risk will be reduced, if we do ban this.

Next, let me rebuttal to their first point. They said that famous places like Tokyo and Kyoto can get money and advertise. However, [a bad?] example [totally?]. However, we believe that this does not change whether you use private homes or not. Because for example, hotels, we can also say that we have [inaudible] private homes the same thing. We have [inaudible]. What is the difference because it is doing the same thing? Rather, we believe that hotels can advertise more because private homes don't have professional knowledge to advertise, "Okay, we have great [nature?]." However, hotels can show the culture and uniqueness of their region. Therefore, we believe that hotels actually can do a better job in attracting tourists. Therefore, we believe that it does not stand.

Okay. Next, let me explain our second point. Our second point is more meaningful school trips. More meaningful school trips. Okay. First of all, let's look at the opposition side [roles?] where private homes are used. Okay. So, for example, I'm in Japan from [Chivas?], but I don't really eat a lot of Japanese foods. I love American foods. I'm in [Chivas?], but I don't eat peanuts, I'd rather eat hamburgers, or stuff like that. Therefore, there's a high risk that if someone comes to my home, they will not see the culture of Japan. Rather because of the globalization, everyone is seeing the same thing in each place. If they come to my home, they'll eat hamburgers, not sushi, because I don't eat sushi at my home. Even if it is in Japan.We believe that rather hotels, they use the uniqueness of their region. For example, if it's a hotel in Japan, they use these like [foreign], or sushi, and they put unique things in their region in order to advertise many things. However, if it is private homes, we believe that many private homes do not respect the culture of their country or their region. Therefore, we believe that the value of school trips is undermined. So if we consider a world where the using these private homes is banned, people can actually see the culture of that place because hotels have professional knowledge how to advertise, how to see other's culture, and we believe that that is very important because what is the meaning of school trips? It is to see many cultures, many regions and have experience about many kind of things. Therefore, we can say it is very important to see each region's uniqueness and culture. Therefore, we proud to support this motion. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. I disagree agree with this motion. First, I rebut opposition's second point. You said it's more meaningful [inaudible]. They can use-- sorry, they can eat Japanese food, or other country's food. However, I think if they use private homes they can eat [inaudible]. If they can study making it.

Next, I will say our second point. Second point is students [inaudible]. If they use hotels it costs a lot of money. And their [inaudible] is [inaudible]. It is [inaudible] for [inaudible]. For example, [inaudible] family [inaudible]. It is a very [inaudible] to [inaudible].Point?Sorry. If [inaudible] because I think teachers [inaudible]. Because that's the possibility they don't become [inaudible]. Therefore, [inaudible].

Hello, everyone. Hello, everyone. [inaudible] is that private homes weak security. My [inaudible] is that we can do legal [inaudible]. And my [inaudible] point is strong because-- so sorry. So sorry. So sorry. [inaudible] this-- [inaudible] is [inaudible]. If [inaudible] private homes as hotels for school trips should be banned I argue. This ban-- so sorry. [inaudible] people [inaudible] people or but private homes, if private homes is because [inaudible] because [inaudible] for, so sorry, [inaudible] because [individualization?]. So my [inaudible] point is strong. Thank you.

Using private homes undermines the value of school trips and just creates risk. The school trips is the event that students, all students, or most of the students are looking forward to be a part of. And it should be carried out as strictly as it is as possible, and as memorable as possible. So let me first rebut to their second point. So they talked about the money and by using private homes we can-- the parents have less burden to pay more to the school trips. However, do you really think the parents will be wanting to pay less money, even it directly connects to the students, or their son's or daughter's safety? We believe it's not, and parents will be willing for the students, or their sons and daughters to have more memorable, or more safe trips in the school trips. So therefore, at this point, does not have very significant effects.

So let me explain which is the most important part of this debate.So first of all, it is clear that school's first priority is student safety. If students are in dangerous circumstances in private homes, which school don't have-- which school has less control over the students, it will only destroy the memory of the school trips. Or it will only make the safety more less controlled. And also because hotels are professionals, and there are many agents that are professionals to give school trips. We must use those agencies because they have the most [inaudible] or certain processes that they make sure that the safety is secure. So therefore, because there will be more safe school trips, and more secure processes in the professional agencies, we should not make the private homes to take care of our students, but we rather use less private homes, or ban those private homes, to be part of our school trips. So therefore, we propose this ban. Thank you.