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Hello everyone. And today's topic is monopolizing the source of information when disaster. And this debate is not about the individual [level?] that this official [rebel?]. And we designed this motion as follows: we define a single source as-- that this is the mass media. And we allow only the ministry of the weather to provide information. Only the government can provide the information. And we have two points.

I'll talk about the first point, to save people from confusion. We believe the government have a responsibility to protect the people from danger and to provide the way to escape. In the [data school?] there are so many source of the weather-- source of the information, so people are confused by choosing their source and we can stop confusion by this motion. So we are strongly proposing this motion. First of all, let me analyze this [data school?]. There are many actor which provide information. There are three actors. The first actor is the government. Second actor is individual. The third actor is company. I'll talk about the first actor, the government. And this is the most reliable actor which can provide the proper information. And the government should be the source of the information.So what if the ministry of the weather make a mistake and everyone who heard the report [crosstalk]?Okay, I'll talk about it. Thank you. And the government should be the actor which can provide the information. There are three reasons. The first reason is that much money. We collect money from the taxation so we can employ the prominent analyzer. By doing so, we can decrease the possibility of providing wrongful information. The second reason is that, [as well?], tax should be used for protection and the disaster is the most case we should use those kind of tax. The third reason is that responsibility. This is most important. I'll talk about that later but I'll just complete first. The individual and company cannot take responsibility but the government can take the responsibility. Even if we provide the wrongful information, we can compensate for that wrong decision. For example, we can provide money or we can provide a shelter. By doing so, we can do the compensation for our wrongful decision. The individual or the company cannot do. There are two reasons. The first reason is that they are the profit-seeker. They provide information which is better for themselves. The government is not so because our role is to protect the citizen. But the individual cannot do so. The second reason is that responsibility. They cannot pay much money. What they can do the most is only giving the punishment. But this isn't the compensations. So we are strongly proposing this motion to saving the people. Thank you.

So I'm Tyrone. [I say?] my speech. So [inaudible] first speaker said. They said that they use our ministry weather forecast but however, that is not accurate completely. They say that they can hire the prominent workers from reporters but that is so unclear how they can create information. Because what if the damage were happening, accident happens to reporters. They cannot report the situation in detail. And those, in terms of responsibility, they say that they can't compensate it for patients-- for suffering if they tell [inaudible]. But that is not true. What if the patients we killed, were in disaster? How do you compensate? You can't just--[crosstalk].No, thank you.-- this is erasable, reversible, right? So they can't compensate. Yes?This is a not case of the information source but you were talking about the case of the reporting the information. What do you think about this point?Yeah. In disaster case, it is imperative to know the real situation, right? With reporters, people who lives in a place that are attacked by disaster can know the real situation by monitor, by reporters, right. So that point, it is important.

So a next remedy next to our point. We have two points. The first point is, guarantee reliable information properly and accurately. And the second is, answer different needs. So I will explain the first point, guarantee reliable information properly and accurately. We disagree with this statement because in order to guarantee accurate and necessary information to [inaudible] people properly and accurately. In the current situation, the disaster such as a storm, heavy rain, eruption, typhoon, [inaudible]; the number is enlarging due to global warming. And many various social media trying [inaudible] in order to offer [buyers?] necessary information to each person. What [various media?] is important? Why many social media is important is one media, if only one media can just [inaudible] limited information each limited region, situation. They have to tell every information equally to all people in order to decrease victim,s to reduce damages.[inaudible] information.No, thank you. And one social media means just one reporter on monitor on each station. In order to tell the real situation, the reporters [are?] imperative but because of it's character, the one reporters on one situation and TV can tell only one [version?] properly if there is only one media. And also, it is dependent on the reporters ability. What if accident happens to the reporters? I said in [inaudible]. There is no one to tell in their situation in detail. It is so harmful to people knowing people [inaudible] attacked by disaster. So what is important? What is important in our motion is it is important to tell various information to minimize damage in disaster. But only one media can just tell only one region in detail and one by to [inaudible] people and it may cause more victims, more damages. So we disagree with the statement. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that we can expect not only to prevent confusion of people but also we can improvement of quality of information. So that is why we are very happy to propose this motion. So let me [inaudible] your first point. Actually, on side of negative, completely misunderstand about this motion, right? So they're only talking about the reporting of [inaudible] or disaster consequence, right? So what we we're talking about is a disaster focus, right. So their first point only talking about the reporting of a dangerous situation or was only talking about the consequence, right. So we're seeing that [inaudible], this is a debate about whether the disaster focus should be monopolized or not, right? So their stuff itself is completely different from this debate.

So next, let me reconstruct the government. First point, they say that we should broadcast the situation or how the victims are suffering. However, as we told you, they also misunderstand me about it. Okay, so we should focus then on the disaster focused because we have the wide vision focused on the consequence but we should focus on disaster focus is that in the situation of disaster, we think that primary information is very important. So we think that in order to broadcast the primary information properly. So that is why we say that those primary information should be issued from a single source. So that is our stance.

So then, let me explain our second point. Second point is the quality of information. So we believe that single source can guarantee the quality of information. What is a quality? In the present situation, for example, earthquake early warning can have the issued when the earthquake early warning issued that, for example, [NHK?] issued it first faster than any other companies, right. So there are differences between the fastest between each company, right. So why this is happened because each company have difference capability or the number of personnel is different from each company, right. So that's why these differences will happen. So after taking proposal, we can have the single source of information, right. So we think that we can concentrate those personnel or we can have enough personnel to deal with such disaster situation. So why it is beneficial? Because [official?] may say that the centralization is very bad because it wants [to flip?]. Actually, we cannot provide enough information. However, we think that we can save stuff, state, and make a rotation with the stuff. We can have enough stuff to deal with such disaster situation, right. So we think that that is actually the beneficial thing. So we are very happy to propose this motion. Thank you.

Thank you, chairman. My name is [inaudible]. I will start my speech. So let me [write?] that also. Okay. Let me [read?] about government's first point. They said that when [inaudible] source to one TV program just tell the same information from meteorological agency. However, that is not true. That's a misunderstanding. They will make information to various forms so that is not true.

And so I have another reconstruction. So they said [inaudible]. So they said, after the [last round?], they can provide suitable focus to each person. However, that is not true. The process is unclear, [quietly?]. So how we can provide suitable information by using the only one source, the process is pretty unclear.

So let me move to my reconstruction. So first, they said our team only think about consequence but that is no true. There is no result consequence without forecast. So that is not true. So I have additional reconstruction. They said they mentioned to forecast. So one source will be burdened however, after adopting our plan, the information will be multiplied and so that is beneficial to people.

So let me move to my second point. The second point is, answer different needs. On their current [station?], there are a lot of groups or companies that provide data so focused, such as the meteorological agency, so called [inaudible], weather news and, of course, each company provides difference data that is really beneficial to people. That's to maintain this variety of information that answer different needs. So we should not limit the source. A single source is not enough.I have two [sub?] points.Yes?Why we should prioritize quantity rather than quality in the case of disaster?So why can you prove that, so-- by more choice of forecast doesn't have quantity. So you have to prove this process. So I have two [sub?] points. The first point is more focus can cover isolated region or place where people can easily get forecast by having more-- so having more just to focus means having many company. That means company can arrange many small departments. So let's think about the case of [Okinawa?] and [NHK?] because [NHK?] strength which is that [NHK?] has [Okinawa?] TV station. They can provide forecast for citizens in [Okinawa?]. And as a result, when disasters happen, they can get quite focused then their lives will be saved.[crosstalk].Sorry. It is beneficial to citizens. And so, at the same point is that people have more choices because of unique diversity of disaster focus. People can take-- require the information. I always think about the case of [instrument?] and the fisher-woman because they can get information regarding sea. So when there is a tsunami, they can notice easier. All [inaudible] they can survey ships which are their property. In long-term, people can reduce the damage of themselves because they can reduce damage of tsunami ships. And for people, they will be saved. So I've got to oppose. Thank you.

Thank you, chairperson. My name is Tomoya. So in order to spread reliable information without leaving anybody not informed of the coming disaster, we must not take this motion. So today's issue is, which will help more citizens and minimize the damage caused by disasters? On this point, their argument is that by monopolization of the source that is issued, they can have a more reliable information and save people from confusion. But however, we don't think this is true because by monopolization, this will rather cause a bigger confusion. Let me explain why this will happen. So, if only one institute is forecasting, then they would have to spread the information to other broadcast and the websites. And if they make a mistake, because they are humans-- even if they are a governmental Institution. If they make a mistake, it is really hard to take back the mistakes and correct them. And this is really dangerous because disaster forecast must be emergency and if they waste a single second or a minute then the cause that will happen from the disaster will be much more bigger. And this is why we need multiple sources that tell a lot of information for different needs living in--[crosstalk].Sorry. Living in various areas. So the reason why we think our research [inaudible] is that we say that disaster forecast that is issued by only one [course?] will cause a lot of harm and it is better to be issued by multiple sources. So as I said, only one source will be biased but if we have multiple sources we can answer the different needs. For example, my second speaker said about fishers.[crosstalk].No, thank you. There are also a mountain climbers. And the ministry of weather cannot completely cover all of this information because right now there are several--[inaudible].Yes?But the wrong information from unreliable resources kills people who really need help. What do you think about this point?Yeah, but they are saying that they will monopolize and only one source will be put into action. And if they make a mistake, people all get the mistaken information and everybody can be at risk of getting killed. However, on our point, we will have multiple sources. People can choose whatever information they can take from it. And that's why we think that people will be protected by giving more multiple sources of the forecast. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that disaster forecast should not be issued from a single source. Let me first revise the opposition's side second point. Firstly, we like to say that their argument is absolutely wrong. Well, firstly, on their second point, they talked about many companies who can't talk about this-- many companies can save these isolated people by showing them. But firstly, these companies are actually telling a lot of unreliable information. So what's happening is that these societies is moved by this wrong information. So what's going to happen is that even the people who really need help, who really wants to have those aids, who really wants to be saved by the government cannot be saved. We think that this cannot be justified. We think that this is not what disaster should be because in the disaster people easily die.[crosstalk].No, thank you. So we think that this is firstly wrong.

And then, to summarize today's debate. The most important point is that quantity is more needed than these information as a resource and moreover, even if there's one mistake, [all this?] unreliable information can be justified. Well, firstly, we'd like to say that, on this point, they said that there are a lot of variety of information and it is good.[inaudible].No, thank you. And however, our argument is superior. It is [better because?] firstly, at the first point, they misunderstand about reporters because we are just saying but if the source is from the government, even the mass media is going to broadcast it [inaudible] freedom of choice, right.[inaudible].Yes?So why can you prove that only one single source is reliable?All right. So one single source, because in the one single source actually this quality is going to improve. Because the government is trying to have those reliabilities-- actually, they are going to cause more information and actually we talked-- [and?] our first speaker, we talk about that these companies are-- these governments are reliable because of them. They have these kind of taxes, and the monies, and the responsibilities, right. And actually, they are the only actors. We can't do the compensation. We think that these governments is actually the reliable sources and actually--[inaudible].--we think the quantity is not needed because-- no, thank you. Because these are reliable information always happen in this place recently, right. We think that because of these unreliable situation, a lot of people are dying. But showing one of these [inaudible]. All right. So showing the government these things, we think that it's reliable and we can save a lot of people. So we strongly believe this motion. Thank you.