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Because corporal punishment severely damages the child's condition in future and because we want to protect their bright future and create a safe society, we beg to propose. So our definition for-- our stance for today is to protect the future of the children and their condition. Our definition is discipline means when the child isn't listening, the parent does something. They do corporal punishment. Or this is done when parents don't agree with what the child is doing. Our first point for today is protect children. And our second point is more abuse. And our second speaker will be talking about that.

So on to our first point, which is protect children. We say that corporal punishment will crucially hurt their-- will hurt children and has a detrimental influence on their conditions and future, so we must prevent this. I have three analysis under this point. First of all, who are parents? Parents are the only actor to protect and accept their children. And this is because the parents and children live together from 0 years old to 18 years old. So they're the only ones to protect that child in that time. They're the only trustworthy and reliable actor because they are always together. If this motion is taken-- because each family is in a closed environment-- because family is a closed environment. No one can see inside the house. There is no one to stop the parents' anger. So it means that it's easy for the parents to attack their children irrationally. So this is because not all parents are nice to their children. And many people become frustrated easily. Now moving on to our second analysis. The border between discipline and abuse. We think that the border between discipline and abuse is very vague. And this is proved by the fact many parents who kill their children say that they only meant it as a discipline.But they abuse their children by hitting them too much. And we think that this is [inaudible] is very vague. But this motion will stop these mistakes from happening. And that's why we are proud to propose. Now moving on to our third analysis. What are the harms? We think there are two harms. First of all, the death of children. Because it's hard to distinguish discipline and abuse, many parents mistakenly kill their children.Point of information?No, thank you. Another example is a two-year-old child died because the parents didn't feed him. In fact, a diaper was found in his dead body because he so hungry. Second of all, he was physically attacked. And there was a lot of bruise found in his body. We can say that her parents-- and also her parents stated how she didn't listen-- how the child didn't listen to them. And therefore, they disciplined her. So we say that these young lives are lost because of parents' corporal punishment and discipline. And therefore, many childrens' lives are severely--Point of information?--no, thank you-- severely hurt and die. We say that children are our future, who shape our society, and are vulnerable actors. And that's why we must protect them. Now moving on to our second harm, toxic communities. Even if children are able to escape the violent abuse they are getting from their parents, we say that they immerse themselves in toxic communities. For example, in poor neighborhoods in US, where there's a lot of abuse by parents to children, the children immerse themselves in communities such as gangs or [inaudible]. And they do drugs and they sometimes kill people. So we say that in many places, even if they are able to escape these parents' abuse, their future is very low quality of life. So in conclusion, because we want to protect these children, we beg to propose. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that corporal punishment is generally bad. We don't deny that. However, in the extreme case, the corporal punishment is the only way-- is the last way to save children. That's why we oppose this motion. First of all, our burden of proof is to show which case needs corporal punishment. First of all, let me rebut what they said. They talked about a lot of case, which has [inaudible]-- their burden of proof is the reason why it should be banned, why there should be no exception.

And I'll move on to our point. Stop suicidal. Stop suicidal. We believe in the case of children who became suicidal, corporal punishment is the only way to save children from losing his life. First of all, let me analyze what is the suicidal. There are three characteristic. The first characteristic is losing ability to understand. Suicidal is mentally depressed. But depression effect is not confined to--[inaudible].--I'm sorry-- not confined to mental, but also the physical. Especially their brain is affected by the depression. So suicidal is losing his ability--[inaudible].--I'm sorry-- to understand. So parents' words, that's no effect on those people. The second analysis is that losing ability to judge. As I told you that suicidal is physically damaged by their depression. So they became crazy. Even cut his body, or drink gasoline, or cut--Clarification, please.I'm sorry. So if this motion is activated, even though their parents face those occasion, what parent can do is to look up his children cutting his body and becoming closer and closer to death. So we should allow parents to save their very, very important [inaudible] children. The three analysis is that suicidal is--Point.Okay.How are you going to save these people by allowing corporal punishment?Okay. Thank you. And as I told you that the suicidal is losing his ability to understand the words. So even if, "Don't do that," or "Don't cut your body," they cannot understand. So physically stopping is only way the parents can do to save his children. The third reason is that the suicidal is mentally depressed.Point.I'm sorry. So therefore, the parents or other people cannot detect that the depression is going on. So the parents face the harsh situation as I told you like that. Suddenly, the parents face those situation. So only the parents can exert his power to save his children. So to sum up, the parents have the-- parents is most likely to face those harsh environment. And only the parents can save his children in those environment. So we are strongly against this motion. Thank you.

We think that opposition today talks on the assumption that all parents are rational. But in the status quo, anyone can have a child. You can be a psychopath. You can be a mass murder, but you can still have a child. We say that because we cannot assure that all parents--Point of information?--no, thank you-- are rational enough to take care of their child to be able to understand when they need to hit a child and when they can't. We think that in order to protect those minority cases or in this case, majority, that are being harmed, it is crucial to ban corporal punishment. Now first, about refutation. One point of refutation against save suicidal people. Two responses. Firstly, you're going to make this suicidal person feel even more worthless. You're hitting that person because you don't think they're worth talking to. Because you don't think that your words will actually reach that person and they don't deserve to actually be talked to. They don't deserve to have therapy. And that they don't have the right to basically be able to confront their parents. And so what this means is that suicidal people are even more likely to kill themselves, because they feel even more worthless. And we think that on top of this, non-suicidal people are likely to kill themselves as well because their parents become the trigger of them feeling worthless. Now second response. They said that these children can't understand their parents' words, that's why we should punish. To this we say that it's the parents' obligation to teach the child what to say, how to act through their words. Or else, obviously, their child is going to learn through the wrong ways. If someone doesn't understand you, you can hit that person. If my judge today doesn't understand my point, I can throw rocks at you because I'm justified in doing so. That's basically what opposition side is saying. And so we think that it's extremely important that these parents teach children how to deal with difficult situations.

Now moving on to my reconstruction. Why ban? Three responses. Firstly, as I said in my introduction, not all parents are rational. And so we cannot allow these parents to decide what's good and what's bad for their child, especially when their child has been significantly harmed. Second response. We think that the line between discipline and abuse is extremely unclear and that these parents will not be able to justify themselves. As the first speaker gave you an example of a 2-year-old child dying because a parent couldn't decide. Third response. We think that restriction would not be effective in this case because you cannot look at all families.And we think that when cases of abuse that are being found out, it's too late. The child is already dead. And so we think that it is more effective to ban.

Now moving on to my point. More abuse. We think that parents teach children morals and shape their identity. So children will carry out the direct actions of their parents. And so when the parents are corrupt people, bad people, they're likely to turn into criminals and harm other people. Because they feel justified in doing so. Two cases. Firstly, bullying. We think bullying occurs because another student doesn't agree with you, doesn't have the same values as you. And so children will feel justified in harming that other student on a larger scale. To attack that person instead of just verbal abuse because they don't understand what they're saying. And so an example of this is a middle schooler really committed suicide because they're bullied by another student who is being abused by their father. The student felt justified in attacking that other student. Second case, harassment. We think that harassment in the workplace is likely to escalate. The reason being is the workplace is extremely similar to a parent-child situation. Your boss is directly above you and they're obligation is to teach you. And so the same analysis can be applied to this place. And so we think that especially vulnerable women who are being attacked in the status quo or weaker workers are likely to be attacked. And will be justified through the idea of discipline. And we think that in the status quo, you cannot hit an adult because it is morally wrong to do so. You cannot hit another person because it significantly harms that person. And so we think the same applies to children. And to protect these especially vulnerable actors, it's important to propose this motion.

Hello, everyone. Because parents love their childrens, if we take this proposal, parents feel helpless, fearing that they cannot do anything that-- when there is a children who want to commit a suicide or there is a children who want to [inaudible] almost commit the violence, or murder, or those cases. So we are very happy to oppose this motion. So let me rebut the government's first point. They say that, yes, this motion can protect the childrens from get injured. However, why those children committed such violence? Usually, parents love their childrens. Of course, there is some cases that a parent is so evil that they bully their children or even kill their children. However, as my first speaker clearly told you that there is a cases that we have to make aware to these childrens by some kind of-- the corporal punishment or those kind of things. So we think that the-- so we think that if the parents have clear purpose that make aware for the childrens or-- for the childrens who going to the murder or such a suicidal, we think that this is the only way to save those childrens from the wrong [conflict?] ones. So that is why--Point.--why banning is the best way to prevent those kinds of crime. We think that criminalizing will do. Other things is enough to prevent those are bully or those abuse. Sorry. No, thank you.

So next, let me reconstruct the opposition first point. The childrens want to-- as my first speaker told you, the childrens want to commit a suicide-- what is the mechanism of children are committing suicides? So children wouldn't hear their voice from the surrounding because they corner their mind into the fear of regret or those kind of things. So we think that to become aware, it should not be [part?] the friends, or their lovers, or teachers. But is the important by the parents. And why it should be corporal punishment? As I told you that they cannot hear from surrounding voices. So we think that if ones hit their childrens, we think that childrens make awareness of how I lose rationality or those kind of things.[Clarification?], please?Sorry. No, thank you.

So yes. Now let me explain our second point. Second point. Lose way to prevent childrens from murder or brutal crimes. So because parents love childrens, they sometimes use corporal punishment with rationality and with a purpose. After they use the corporal punishment, childrens become conscious. So when the case that childrens are too violent or almost committing crimes. So after thinking this proposal, parents want-- even the parents want to stop them from committing crimes or those kind of things. They can't do so. So we think that parents like the feel the helpless feeling for the childrens. So we think this is a very harsh environment for the parents. So that is why we think that corporal punishment is the only way to save childrens from committing crimes, or brutal murders, or suicide. That is our important point. Thank you very much.

Hello. And we believe that parents should not be banned from corporal punishment of the children for this point. Let me summarize today's debate. The most important point is should corporal punishment can be permitted in some cases? Because it is our burden of proof. So on this point, their idea is that they should ban all of these corporal punishments done by these parents without any kind of exceptions. However, our argument is superior. It is because, first of all, as our first speaker and second speaker told you, there is a cases that we need to use these corporal punishments because the children are irrational or doing something wrong. We think that in these cases, we need to use it. What is the cases? The first speaker told you. And that is suicidal cases. Lastly, we think that the children will commit suicide. Actually, they do not have enough rationality. Because they are--[inaudible].Yes?[We think that?] murder is kill with purpose. How can you say that parents would protect their children with good purpose?So first of all, as our second speaker told you, is the parents are going to do this-- well, this is a crime. Or if we're going to-- if the parents are going to do this kind of abuse, we think it can be criminalized is all. So moving back to our point, we think that these kind of suicides not be justified because if these children are going to do this suicide, the only person who can actually stop these children is actually the parents. The parents is the only person who can protect us. We actually agree that the parents is the only person who can think about these children. We think that that this is the most important point because these children will be stopped from doing these crimes, from dying. And moreover, we talk about these violent murders. We think that actually, in order to protect those children to lose their future-- actually, they talk about these gangster cases or other cases. But what we think is that actually, if these children are going to do these kind of crimes, are going to be in these kind of gangsters, or do some kind of violent criminals-- actually, this is the only case that-- this can be justified because these parents are going to stop them by using their bodies. They're going to do this corporal punishment in some cases. But actually, this is actually going to stop these children and protect these children to lose their futures. We think that this the best case. Therefore, we strongly believe that if, in some cases, that they can-- children cannot do-- parent should protect these people. We strongly believe that corporal punishment should be allowed. Thank you.

Opposition side's burden of proof is [inaudible] that specifically corporal punishment is necessary to discipline children. We're not animals. We're humans. We understand words. Especially by parents when they have trust. So moving on to the refutation toward the second speaker. So they said how parents, by punishing them corporally, they can prevent extremely bad children from committing murder. However, two responses to this. First of all, children with violent parents tend to become violent as well. As an example of the second speaker, I said this long-term cycle occurs. Because of this, we believe that this is not effective to these children. Secondly, they have explained no process of how specifically corporal punishment, not verbally telling, can prevent this from happening. For example, even in prison, we don't teach them by hitting them. We teach them verbally. And we provide them a lot of skills. Therefore, they can go back to the society.

So moving on to the clash point, societal impact. So even if we take their case entirely-- taking their best case that some children can be saved from suicide and committing murders. It is much more dangerous to let parents to corporally punish their children. The world with corporal punishment admits violence overall. As the first speaker has said, vulnerable children will be hurt and may even die because of this. As an example, a second-years-old child died because of abuse. So because the border between abuse and discipline is very vague, there is high possibility of mistakenly kill the children. And second of all, as the second speaker said, vulnerable women within workplace or other students will be attacked because of violence itself. Because violence itself will be accepted within the society. So because in the society, there'll be more violent by admitting corporal punishment, we beg this propose this motion. Thank you.