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Government goals. It is to protect student [inaudible] house. Now, most of the team of online game players are enrolled by games because they are to advantage online games uniquely. Closer restriction and [inaudible] to say that these players form [inaudible], which government should intervene the online-- playing the time online games, so [inaudible]. Today, I will divide my speech three parts-- two parts. One, I will define this debate, and second, I will introduce our first point. This is harm of health. Harm of health. And our second point, it's really leading proactive life. Leading proactive life. And it will be a explained by my partners. Next item, our definitions. First definition is the [inaudible] time spent on online games, two hours. Two hours. And the second definition is that we have penalty of crime to the overplaying-- playing over two hours.

So, next argument on our first point, harm or health. Sorry, no, thank you. Harm or health. Now, [inaudible] including the smartphone or personal computer, more and more people conducting online games, and online has the update time [inaudible] and day-by-day. So players won't feel boring to playing online game community. So all players become addicted to playing, without thinking time to sleep, without thinking time to eat, and without thinking time to do necessary things on daily. But if we have serious example from addiction to the online games, one player-- this is example, one player stops to play and he become addicted to the [inaudible]-- addicted to playing online games continuously. As a result, he didn't spend time to eat and he didn't spend time to sleep, and he died because of the online games. As I explained, all for [inaudible], online games uniquely have addictions and uniquely have a seriousness on our health because most of the people will addicted because don't-- they are not feel now boring and they forgot-- they all thinking and caring about all selves. Like the health and eating [inaudible]-- and eating [inaudible]. Essential things for us. So playing online games is uniquely harmful and harm all our health. So the government should intervene the time to play the online game. So [inaudible]. Thank you.

Hello everyone. We believe that government shouldn't restrict the time spent on online games. Let me read back what the government team said. They said games cause the health problems. However, these problems are personal responsibility. For example, smoking are allowed-- sorry, are allowed although it is harmful to smokers. Therefore the health problems are their personal responsibilities. Sorry.Point.Point.

Next, let me explain our point. We have two points. The first point is profits of game companies. The first point is profits of game companies. The second point is personal responsibility. I will explain the first point, profits of game companies. We believe in this days, we can buy a lot of online games for free such as [inaudible], [inaudible], and so on. So game companies are mainly from advertising company and customers' additional charge. If government restricted the time spent on online games, companies would earn our money more difficulty.I have a question.Sorry. Advertisement company pay the company less because time for spending-- time for showing advertisements became less and customers pay less money because that game wouldn't be developed. The game story wouldn't-- that game character wouldn't get more stronger. So if government restrict the time gamers would play games, little by little, this is not able to happen, happy competition between customers. Customers want to be stronger than other customers. So without the difference between customers, they didn't pay money to game customers to be more stronger than other customers. Therefore, our government shouldn't restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you. [applause]

Online game is luck. Once we now play online game, we cannot stop playing game. It is no longer [inaudible], it is [inaudible]. That is why it is not a case with freedom of choice. According with this issues, I will like to make a remark. Today, our arguments as follows, first, [inaudible], second, the legal [inaudible], third, the [inaudible]. Second argument, leading [inaudible]. First of all, I'll like to [inaudible] the opponent. They said company' benefit is important, but why do we have to prioritize company's benefit? Why, thousands of people suffering from addiction coming from playing game. As we indicated in the first speech, many people are suffering from the addiction of playing game, for example. And also that this cause the unhealthy lifestyle and sometimes, what is worse, is that some people will die because of addiction of playing game. That is why we have to eradicate the risk of death and risk of unhealthy lifestyles.

Lastly, move on legal [laughter].[inaudible].Sorry. Lastly, [inaudible] legal [inaudible]. They say our argument or the health problem is self-responsibilities. However, as mentioned above, it is not the case with self-responsibility because it is not by choice. Playing game have addictive characters. As mentioned above, we cannot stop playing game. But especially, it is this case with children case. Children cannot think rationally because of a lack of experience or because that natural characteristic. If children love playing game, especially children cannot stop playing games. That is why we--A point of information. A point of information.

I would like to move on. New argument. It is leading proactive life. Online game don't have ending because of continuous update by games company such as [inaudible] or [inaudible] and so on. People don't get tired playing online game. It is now addiction. It is [inaudible]. This is the same as [inaudible]. Especially, this leads to catastrophic damage on the student. As we indicated in the first place, damage by online game leads to unhealthy lifestyle. Moreover, it [inaudible] on proactive life. Online player lose motivation to do anything, such as study, working, even taking bath or brushing teeth, and so on. Especially, this place a very big damage on students. Sometimes students are addicted with playing game and stop going to school, even compulsory education. For example, precious time as a student-- we cannot recover the precious time which we lose-- sorry. And also we lose opportunities to get minimum education because of addiction. Commonly playing game each and every day is [inaudible] what human being should be. It is not their cultural life and as Japanese constitution [inaudible]. From that viewpoint, practically, philosophically viewpoint, it is not acceptable and limitation is necessary. Thank you for listening. [applause]

Hello, everyone. We believe that government should not restrict the time spent online game. Let me rebut government's first point. They said game is harmful for us and we may die because of games. However, is it really true? I think it's not reality and if there are people who were dying through to game, they will try to quit game. It makestheir responsibility-- sorry.

As for government's second point, they said games are not ending so we can't stop playing games. However, so we can't grow our responsibilities more. Next, let me go throughout-- okay[inaudible] because of addiction-- addictive characters, we cannot stop working. And we cannot stop the playing games, and there is no [inaudible] in this choice. What do you think about that?[inaudible].Playing games is very addictive. That is why there is no rationality in this choice which we decide to play game, [inaudible].This was [inaudible] for [inaudible] so we can decide to play game, and not to spend time on other things.

Next, let me go [inaudible] first point. They said games is bad for health, so game companies profit is not important. However, this industry is really effective in Japan industry. So it's really important point.Point.Sorry.

Let me explain our second point. We believe government should not have intervention to our free time. There a lot of people who enjoys games. If they fell down or [inaudible] up. Have you ever feel like-- ever enjoyed game when you have a [inaudible]? We can waste time. Government should not prevent people with that. Then, it's true, we can waste time to play games and [inaudible] to game, According to our research. However, it's important to have a [inaudible] time, and we should have responsibility to spend our free time. For example, [inaudible] this big, such as we have-- today, we have to manage 15 minutes. [inaudible] isn't [inaudible] where we usually live and manage time, it's important our livings. Thank you.

Okay, let me start my speech. Should government have to restrict its [inaudible] responsibility or freedom of choice [inaudible]? One, the choice is irrational. Two, it's a [inaudible] to public welfare and this is-- online games is a blight to the [inaudible]. That's irrational choice because people are easily addicted by the playing games and they cannot [crosstalk] playing games. So government have to intervene each person's choice to spend the time. This is why we have to propose this motion. So [inaudible] their second argument. So they [inaudible] a reduction of the stress and so on, but actually, even these activities can be restricted by government if we can say that this is a harm for the people. So this is surely a blight to the-- harmful against the public welfare and peoples' lives. Okay, I'd like to explain a two cross point today. First cross point is whether today's situation is serious or not. Actually, this is really serious because even people are dying because they [inaudible] playing too much online games, too much. And even if that [inaudible] to the death, they cannot manage their time because this is an irrational choice, and they are addicted with online games, and they cannot decide how to spend their time rationally. If they took the self-responsibility-- this is an irrational choice, as I continuously said. This is why the government will have to restrict and assume the [inaudible] for their citizens' lives and the health.

Okay, second cross point is which is a bigger advantage or damage by after taking this motion? Actually, we can get [inaudible] benefitting for especially citizens because this motion successfully worked, because they will be punished [inaudible] money if they are playing overtime. And [inaudible] some companies' cases, but nothing is precious than peoples' lives. Moreover, this company opened many kinds of games because the additional payment is unstable income resource. It is really difficult to think that companies are rely on that-- only that income resource. So we don't have concern about this point-- concern this point. This motion about restricting the time will surely work as a deterrence against playing too much, and we can save peoples' lives. So we strongly propose this motion. Thank you. [applause]