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Hello, everyone. Today's topic is using private homes as hotels for school trips to be banned. First, let me define the topic. We define that most private homes and hotels provide the same quality of satisfaction. We on the government team has two points. The first point is, risk of emergencies. The second point is that increased risk of the health.

I will explain first point. Our side's first point is risk of emergencies. Sorry. When we use the private homes as hotels, it's just a private home, so it's really small. So there has a limitation to stay at the private home. So for example, where we stay at the hotel, we can stay many people so that teacher can see all the students. But when we stay at the private homes, teacher needs to go to every house to check that their house [secure?], how they feel. So it must be really different to stay at the hotel or at the private home.And also, if they have some emergencies, like nature disaster, when it happens, those, we plan, if we stay at those places, it happens that we can't contact each other, because of out of order. Like nowadays, everybody's using phones. So that is a really common ways to contact with each other. But when we are in those places, if we can't-- it's out of order, so we can't connect all of the students. But at hotels, we can contact each other in just one places, not in every places. And also, nowadays, like there are many-- private homes as hotels are increasing, by foreigners, it's really cheap. But it has a risk of emergencies. They need to be safe. So the most important thing, to be safe, not cheap. So therefore we strongly believe that the using private homes as hotels for school trips should be banned. Thank you.

Okay. Using private homes as hotels is very convenient and cheap, and good for students in terms of their experiences. That's why we oppose this motion strongly. And firstly, I would like to make it clear what this motion says. We opposition side support that using private homes as hotels for school trips should not be banned. In other words, we do not force any schools, any school trips, to use private homes definitely. And so, and as an option we should have a choice to use private homes and-- it is our stance, so let me-- a little confused. Let me make it clear. And so, we believe the student-- and also, we believe that schools should make judgement, have a discussion with teachers, or among teachers or parents and so on, and they discuss what they [propose?] the value of, and then decide whether they use the private homes as hotels. So let me, I'll speak in-- in my [inaudible], I'll talk about two things. First is reputation, will be our first point. The second is my main argument. First, reputation to the first point. They say at hotels they can contact each other, and make it clear that there is safer or not in hotels. However, we can, in a private situation, we have a very good social networking service, or phone, using phone, our teachers can contact with them, and students can contact each other, and then they can recognize them, how their health is good or not. And also, we have that private homes is very far, they said. However, we can-- choosing the private homes close to each other, we can fix this problem, right? And also, they said that the private homes is very small, but we can choose a big private homes as well.So it doesn't matter, we think.

And next, I would like to talk about our main arguments. We have two points. First is following the purpose of school trips, and second is convenience of school trips. I'd like to talk about our first point. First point is following the purpose of school trips. We think the purpose of school trips is first, to go do sightseeing spot, and enjoy and have fun with the schools, with the members of, our friends. However, not only that purpose, but also we have the learning purpose, that learning cultures and customs of their visited spot, and by making conversation with them, or the local people, adds a experience. However, just using hotels is just staying that place, and on the other hand, private homes, students can put their foot on their real cultures and visit places, and they can learn as experiences, how their culture, what kind of culture they have, and that is good for following the purpose of schools, and good for education for them. And we can say that it is the following the purpose of school trips. For example, visiting Kyoto is that just, of course it's going to the sightseeing. So for example, [inaudible] is very important. However, we know that also, the listening to their people, local people, and have the discussion, and absorbing the culture is very important, really. So therefore, we are strongly oppose this motion. Thank you.

Okay, first of all, you said that you can contact using cell phones to teachers, but we believe that students lack the understanding of the situation because when earthquakes happen, for example, the ground is shaking, and you get panicked, and students lack understanding of the situation. Because the motion says that it's school trips, and school is not just only high school, but it includes elementary schools, all kinds of schools. So we believe that those small children lack--But if they're in elementary schools, schools can make a decision not using the private homes if they think it's dangerous.Okay. We believe that it is very important to ban all at once, because is there is a discrepancy between each school, for example, if A district goes to A school, and B district-- no thank you. If B district goes to B school, and if there's a difference, but they're living in the same prefecture, parents will be mad at A school if A school gets the more dangerous option. So we believe that it is very important to ban all at once to make a very equal environment for all students living in the country. For your point, I will say that following the purpose of school trips is very important, and we agree to that point. But as we defined, there's no-- we think that there's absolutely no difference in the experience we have, even if we stay at hotels or private homes. We believe that hotels are good enough, because [inaudible] you said, [inaudible] in Kyoto and it is better if-- it could be good if you stayed in private homes, but there are good hotels in Kyoto, too. And there's so many, so many good hotels today, and there is so much maintenance, and it is safer, so we believe that, as for the safety for a child, we believe that hotels are better. No thank you.

So moving on to our second point, we believe that private homes just increases the health-- the risk of health failure. So for example, a National Health Administration can check the hotels, and hotels have compliances to follow, and their annual, monthly checks in the kitchen, or dishes, or how they manage their businesses. But in private homes, there is none of those maintenances, and availability of checks. For example, when we went to [inaudible]'s private home, there was bad facility, and the doors and restrooms were very broken and old. Some people say that all facilities are very good, because it creates an old atmosphere, and it will create more kind of the atmosphere that you can relax in, feel like home. But some will say this, that it is unique and very good, but we believe that safety and health is more important for students, because we're talking about schools. It's not individuals trip or vacation. We're talking about schools, and teachers taking the students to go to places. So we believe that risks of health and emergencies is the most important things, not just experience. But those risks are-- we need to care about that a lot more than just the happiness or satisfaction. So we strongly oppose to this-- so we agree to this motion, and we're proud to be the government side. Thank you.

[foreign]. I will do three things in this speech. First of all, [inaudible], first [vacation?], second I [inaudible] to assert our second point. So first of all, vacation they talk about, now one and two argument, they talk about the risk. But first of all, as one of our-- first [speaker already?] explained that we-- our stance, we increase the choice of the hotels by taking this motion. By opposing this motion, we mean. So we mean, if the schools put the high [inaudible], they can choose the hotel, right? So we don't force them to go to something private home. So we think their argument, in terms of uniqueness, there are many lack of [uniqueness?]. So our next-- they talk about the second point, they talk about something like quality of--risk of health, or something like that. They talk-- there's something contradiction happens. They talk about their stance, they think that private home and hotels, they are same quality. They talk about--[foreign].I'm sorry. So there, some contradiction happens. So their argument are extremely-- So yeah, I think it's very long. And also, even if their argument stands, there is not guarantees that the hotels are more safety than private homes, right? There's no guarantee. There is no guarantee.[foreign].

So we mean-- I'm sorry. So we mean, their argument is very lack of process. Their lack of something like that. So please, I'm emphasizing the one thing, that we increase the choice by adding the private homes. So please remember that. And moving onto our second point, our second point is that more [companies?]. In the present situation, every student using the hotels, and every [inaudible] they use the hotels, public hotels, the two problems happens in the present situation. But one problem is, it's very expensive. And the second point is about inconvenience. So let me explain one by one. The first of all, it's very expensive. In the present situation, [inaudible], especially the public schools, the parents will pay that money to go to school trips. So you've got the school trips, really expensive. They can pay, and they can--[foreign].That students can afford-- I'm sorry. The students can experience these kind of school trips, right? So it's very serious situation in [inaudible]. And second problem is inconvenience. In the present situation, there's not only the choice of the hotels. This means, if they want to keep that [inaudible], they have to stay out to the nearest hotels. It might be used by train. It's very long. So it's very serious situation. And second--[foreign].There's, yes please.Isn't taking trains to go to [Kinkan-ji?] another kind of experience, as you say?There's many experiences, I think. So if they are private hotels, they can stay up there. And this means, it's [easier?]. More students can experience these kind of school trips, and the second problem is solved.[inaudible].No, I'm sorry. And it's very convenient, because our stance, that it's in [place?] [inaudible]. So it's very important to active [inaudible]. These cannot be-- more and more and more people will-- yeah, more and more people will experience these kind of things. Thank you.

One thing that is problematic about the other side is that they completely misunderstand the problem. The problem, such as this thing like the quality of the private homes, these kinds of problems is not unique to taking this motion. It's not about this motion. It is a problem of the testing, right? It's the testing. How the government is going to test these kinds of private homes to be admitted. Be guaranteed as a place to stay, right? It's not a problem about taking this motion or not. It's about a problem of whether there is testing. And right now, it's justified or not. So they completely misunderstand the problem. So their second point about private homes having a very low quality, it's not unique to this motion, because we can change that by making the laws strict for these private homes to be admitted as laws. So yeah, their second argument doesn't completely stand. Now, 81, sorry, their first argument, about the risk of emergency. We believe that the schools will first of all not-- so let me just clear one thing. The schools or the parents are not going to force the children to use the private homes, right? They can still use the hotels, too. However, considering the benefits that we have proposed--[crosstalk].

No, thank you. It is much more important to actually take this motion. Now, so right. So their first point about emergency. We believe that the schools will, in the first place, because they consider the safety of those students, right? And of course safety is in the top priority. So these kind of schools can actually make more checking in these kinds of testing. So it's not a problem about whether taking this motion or not. Moving on to our side of the house. Our first point about the purpose of school trips, about the purpose of education and experiencing the culture, and our second point about the convenience, convenience to going to these kind of sightseeing spots. Our points were both about fundamental, important things, such as the purpose of education, right? Why do we go to school trips? Because the students need to understand the culture, and understand how people think, how their perspectives work. And that is the most important thing in these school trips. It's not about the low quality of the stay. That's just a means of going to the school trip, right? It's not-- the main purpose of going to these school trips is not staying in the hotels. It is about experiencing. It is about learning about these kinds of history. Learning about how they think. So that is why we are very unique, and the other hand, their side is completely [inaudible]. [Thank you?].

Thank you Mr. Chair and to everyone. So far we've been talking about whether or not using private homes for hotels for school trips should be banned. We on the government team, we strongly believe that using private homes as hotels for school trips should be banned. First, let me rebuff opposition's second point. They said that using private homes as hotels for school trips is more convenient. However, compared convenience and risk, risk of emergencies and health, the risk is more serious. Therefore, they are [certainly?] wrong. Then I will summarize-- no, thank you. Then I will summarize this debate. The most important point is risk of emergencies and health, and cultural experience. As for the first one, risk of emergency and health, they say that using internet can protect the students from the danger of the health or-- there is existence of freedom of choice. It will just increase the choice. But however, we argue that taking this [inaudible] is the most important thing, because after taking this [stance?], there is same quality for all students, and that's the most important thing.

Let me move on to our second point, culture experience. They said that staying at private homes, students can learn culture experience, and talking with local people that can be a cultural experience. However, we argue that you still can have a cultural experience staying at hotels, and in addition to that, you're more likely to choose cheaper private hotels ignoring the risk of emergencies and emergencies in health. Therefore, we argue that using private homes and hotels for school trips should be banned. Thank you.