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Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. In my speech we have two argument to talk about. In my speech, I talk about one argument, but I talk here about three definition. In the today definition, we will set a limit only on the children who are under 18 years old.

Moving to our first argument. First argument is, prevent children from addiction in online game. What is online game? Companies are trying to attract children. They want children to spend much time on online game because company want to get much money from children with spending much time on the online game. And also, company wants children to buy many more games with attracting children. So even the adults are spending much time for games. Especially for the children. Children are mentally immature. So the three analyses. Firstly, they cannot prevent themselves from spending much time on online game. Secondly, the children try to improve their skills in the game because children are competing each other on online game. They try to be stronger and defeat other children, and they spend much time. And so, as a result, they spend much time on online game. Thirdly, they don't know how precious study is, or how precious those other things is. Because they don't know how they spend on online game affects seriously on their life, although they need to study more to improve their academic level, and especially so that children academic level, academic background is the most important thing in their life. But, because children don't know how precious those things is, children, unfortunately, spending much time on the online game. And lastly, why government? Parents cannot prevent children from playing online game. Because, in these days, parents are likely to be busier and busier. These days, both parents are working until late in night, or such [inaudible] things. And also, they pay less attention on their children. Actually, in these days, who are getting obligation or responsibility when children commit some wrong things is not the parents, but the schools. Those situation is causing children from paying less attention-- those situation is causing their parents paying less attention on the children. And other than that, children are likely to spend much time and there is no restriction from the parents. All those situation are causing spending much time [inaudible] for the online game. And other than that, children cannot study at all in the home, and, even in the schools, some children are playing online game in the classroom. As a result, what will happen? Firstly, children's future will be disturbed. Because in the society, academic background being most importance, especially if children cannot go to high school or so. Children will get serious damage on their life. And especially, as a result, the children get serious harm because they they cannot study well and their academic background is low and the children get serious harm in their future. Online game causes bad effect to the children and especially children cannot get academic [inaudible] and as the children get taught. So only the government can prevent children from playing those online games and improve the children's academic background. That's all. So we should take this plan.

Hey. Hello everyone. We believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Let me explain their definition. It's too strict and wrong. Firstly, in their definition, the users of playing game is until 18. But that definition is too strict to discuss in this motion. If they do so, the impact will be small, therefore, until 18 is wrong. And secondly, in their definition, they didn't explain how government restrict playing game. So the probability is very small. [inaudible]. Next, let me read about what the government team said. They said the children cannot control-- only children are playing online games too much and they can't concentrate on studying. But there is a solution. They can control themselves or their parents can regulate them. For example, in my family, my brothers are playing online game, but my parents always saying that after studying, after doing homework, you can play the game. So there's a solution. Sorry. Therefore, there was no uniqueness of online games. Therefore, their first one is weak.

Next, let me explain our points. We have two points. The first point is lose individual freedom. The second point is companies' profit were decreased. I will explain the first point, lose individual freedom. Many people are enjoying to playing online games. For example, [inaudible], Pokémon, and so on. This is one of the amusement for all people. They are enjoying them for break time, for studying, for a change, or making community, and with friends, and so on. They play them whatever or whenever they want. This is individual freedom. This is admitted by the government. But after take this motion, their individual freedom will be destructed. The amusement will be taken away. Note it's not good for our basic philosophy for the government and for the people. [inaudible]? Yes, please. So why does freedom very important? Because the playing game is one of the amusement. And the government should respect the-- one of the amusement. Playing the game is not worth restricting. Their explanation is not enough. We move to say playing the game is not worth restricting. It's not good for government role. Therefore, we should not take this one. Thank you.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Our first [inaudible] for the [inaudible]. And nextly, I will introduce our second argument. Our second argument is the what addiction cause for the children's life. Okay. First the rebuttal. Our [inaudible] is to restrict to discuss pretty much that the reason why we be strict on children is research. Clearly childrens is immature. So they cannot restrict themselves, they cannot control themselves, so we have to do that. So in the first place, this district is complete irrelevant. So our plan is completely better. Second, they say that government cannot restrict this [inaudible] time. So, okay, I will [inaudible] the next point. The government can make order to the company to make system up to restrict the game time of the children. Actually, some of the company could succeed to make system of restrict the time of game about health. So their point is completed down [inaudible]. Nextly, therefore their argument. [inaudible] individual's freedom is very, very important. But [inaudible] for example, in the presentation that R-18 game, children cannot do those kind of game, right, because government is restricting. Why government can restrict? Is government actually think that this kind of game is completely bad effect for the children, right? So this is a criteria of government can restrict the things for the children. But this is completely meeting the criteria. Actually, as we said, this kind of game is dominating the children and are harming the children. So that is very, very meeting the criteria of government can restrict. So their point is completely down [inaudible]. And the children should not have this kind of freedom completely.

Okay. Next [inaudible]. I will introduce our argument. What addiction will cause to the children? I have three point what children get damaged. So firstly, the experience, the making friends. They may lose time or even they will be fears to come and get to meet with friends. In high school time, that is very, very important, because only in high school time they can make friends that is connected forever, right? So this kind of friends is very, very important and this kind of experience is important. Secondly, the sweating or exercise, some of them that staying up all night to play game. That very, very harmful for their health. The high school time is very, very likely to affected this kind of bad healthy. So in high school transition not do that. Thirdly, the addiction. So they will charge money in online game. That is very, very social for them even in the presentation, right? So-- [inaudible]? No. Thank you. So they will use money for the online game. But they won't use for their necessity, or for their friends, or such kind of things. That's very, very restricting their life. So I think that to restrict the time of games, their life will be very, very wealthy. So we should take this [inaudible]. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. Today we believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online game. First, let me check out team line. We are talking about people who play games. Everyone could play game, because a game user is not just the people who are until 18 years old but also adults also play games. Now, let me rebut their first point. In their first point, they say that games will affects children's study in a bad way, but when we study, we need to refresh, we need to relax in order to relieve the stress. A game is a really good way; therefore, a game could be really helpful in studying. No, thank you.

Now, let me rebut their second point. In the second point, they say that there is harm on children, but on the other hand, they say that, in high school, we have to make friends but we can make friends through games. For example, in online games, we can make friends. Also, if we find someone-- [inaudible]. No, thank you. If we plays online games in my class, we can be friend. Also, they said, "Our sleeping and exercise," but high school students actually can control themselves. For example, I like to play games but I don't play so much because I can control myself. And also, they say - no, thank you - about spending money on games, but online games, there is warning that people who are under 18 years old do not spend so much money on games. Therefore, their second point is completely wrong.

Now, let me reconstruct their first point. On their first point, they say that government should restrict it, but it's not government's job. It's player's own responsibility and also it's parents' responsibility to control them. Therefore, our first point clearly stands.

Now, let me explain our second point. Our second point is, company's profit will decrease. [inaudible], company make big money by users pay money to company or [inaudible], which is own the things. But after that plan, the money, which made by game company, will decrease because many people cannot play game when they-- no, thank you. When they want to play, so the motivation for game will decrease and people will not pay so much money on games. Also, the time that advertisement appear on the screen will decrease, so the company's profit will surely decrease. If this happens, company's profit will decrease and people who are working for the company or the company is playing big role in Japan's economy, so economy will also deteriorate. In order to save people and also the Japan's economy, we should restrict this plan. Thank you.

Hi, everyone. We agreed that governments should not restrict time spent on online games. First of all, [inaudible] look at our team's stance, we focus on children but we focus on everyone else who play games. Not only children but also adults, because taking care of children is not government's job, it's parents' responsibility. Then [inaudible] the most important point is the individual freedom, and government really need to restrict the time of online games. We said before that whether they play online games or not, it's individual freedom. Also, how many time when people play it, it's also their freedom and their own responsibility. Government should never [inaudible] this freedom and, on this point, the online game affect the children badly, especially [inaudible] and [inaudible] children. [inaudible] the first point. Also, the second speaker explained that parent-- first and second speaker explained that even our parents [inaudible] if you play online game too much, and also online games can be useful to - no, thank you - keep refreshed between your study. And the second of that is make friends, but we can make friends by playing games together, and the company has a solution on program that [inaudible] by the children. So their first points are very weak. However, please look at our third point on individual freedom. Now people enter online games as entertainment. They want to play it when they want to. They want to play it as many times as they want to. It's the same as other entertainment like drinking. The government hasn't invade these right to entertainment, so government has no reason why government restrict the time on only online games. And the second point, this is that-- no. We say that companies profit will be lost because many people will lose [inaudible] to play games, connect the people's lives, and [inaudible] the economy. They focus on only student, on only [inaudible], but we focus on two targets and two impacts. So we [inaudible] online game. Thank you.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Firstly, I will talk about why we should debate about children. In the first place, it is justified-- everything on children must be justified because in the [inaudible] children is-- online game is especially harmful children. Actually, our children are now actually-- our children are prohibited go out midnight because it is, specifically, harm to children. So, like that, because online games is specifically harmful to children, we must talk about all the children in this debate. Please check [inaudible].

Next, I will talk about their second argument, companies profit. However, in the present situation, now government making law which [inaudible] companies right. This case is alcohol or tobacco. Actually, government said that, now, only adult can buy and can use tobacco or alcohol because tobacco or alcohol is, specifically, harm to children. So that's why now our government are restricting children from buying, sorry, alcohol or tobacco. So companies' right is decreased. So they are [inaudible] point is [inaudible].

Finally, I will talk about which society is better for children. So now, many children are addicted to the online game even though parents and children are making biggest effort to prevent from becoming addicted, and no one but government can solve this problem. However, [inaudible] are actually-- time which children are spent on online game will decrease, and they have great-- they will have more opportunity to study which is necessary and which is more important than online game. So we strongly support this motion. Thanks. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.