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First of all, let me define to this motion that the online game is like-- I'm sorry. That who disrupts the online game is the online company which has produced the online games and how it is then we can disrupt the people who are doing the online game login-- doing the log in the game. And the company takes the time and if the two hours is passed, the company shut down that online games. And this case is not only Japanese case, it is a world case. And we've been doing the online games like the many device, like the PC or a smart phone or something like that. And today, we have two arguments. Our first argument is stop addicting. Stop addicting. And the second argument is charging money. Charging money. And before I talk about our second argument,

so let me talk about our first argument. Our first argument is stop addicting. Online games are very easy to addicting and online games is-- every people can do it because it's not-- if some people have the smart phone or PC, we can easily do the online games. So it's not related to our age, gender, or work. So all people can do the online game and online game is especially [inaudible] for the others game. The online game is always updated, like the company doing the new event on the online game. So it's not have the end-- it's not have the end like the usual where these games have the end. But online games don't have the end. So it is only [inaudible]-- so it is more and more people like other games because they don't have the end so they always long and long after they learn their end. But the online game has not end. So it is easily that the people addicting the online games. And that means the people use many times for the online games.For example, in my case, I'm doing the five online games every day, for example, I get up at five o' clock and I'm doing the two hours for the morning and I get back my home, I'm doing the online games and it is tomorrow day. So I doing that, but I wanted to stop that, but online game is addicting so I cannot stop, control our self, and I think time is very not useful, because I have to doing many things like studying or more have to sleeping or that. So it is very-- almost like our daily life [inaudible]-- almost like our daily life is a very stressed situation. Sorry, our times up. For this, we think the government should restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you.

Thank you, chairperson. My name is [inaudible]. Let me leave up their first point. They lead to the problem of addiction but it is out of point because they didn't take kind of therapy offered by government in their consideration.What [inaudible]?Sorry? This effect is so big because-- please think about your experience. Did you see some people addicted by online make a problem in the society? Would it make problem in this society? So--[inaudible].--at this point their impact is very low.

Secondly, I will explain Fastpoint. Fastpoint, it's light of freedom. And secondly, damage for company of online game. I will explain the Fastpoint, light of freedom, light of freedom. Possible whether we play video game or not, it's free and this freedom is guaranteed by constitution, by adapting from this [inaudible] obey this constitution and damage citizens' morale and independence. Playing game is very personal problem. Sorry. By [inaudible] this from all the reasons or action making by citizens based on law. This is, sorry, very bad thing because the independence of CDs and-- it's seriously damaged by this problem. For example, in Germany, the Nazis, example, where citizens stop thinking by their self, they cannot take own way anymore.[inaudible].Yes.But they cannot do the online game. We have that limit. We have to make the limit so they can do the online game so [crosstalk] program.So I want to say that some of interference for the citizens may happen by this brand. This is damage for independence of citizens. So this effect is so big because the human freedom will be limited in the future because of this happening of this legalizing the limit for the online game. So take this point. Yes?Are you think that [inaudible] future in the online game?I want to say that it can be the factor to limit the citizens' freedom in the future. Any interference for citizen cannot be permitted unless it is on laws-- it is not legalized. So [inaudible] importance the independence of the citizens is very important, so our point is very strong. Thank you.

First, let me reconstruct our first [inaudible], the effect of-- [inaudible] by the government don't have to interversion to a citizen's life [inaudible] is not listening but it is not based to society's standards, but in the current situation, there are many people who spend the time for online games so they make online game-- they make [inaudible] many times for online game. Then other things, for example, our job or something important. Also the spending many times for online make bad relationship with family because of lack of communication. So it is possible their house and their home and their job because it make interference for a job.POI?Yes.The lack of communication by spending many time on online game. So what's [inaudible] with the society and how damage--?[inaudible] if relationship between the family will worse, they cannot connect to ways to others. For example, [inaudible] and relationships will be worse in these days. So we have to make important of relationship.

And also, going back to your first argument, think about right of freedom. But government problem make restrict. For example, the alcohol, air, or tobacco. Government make it tough for them. It [crosstalk]--POI?No, thank you. Restrict for them because all of them are bad for their health and bad for their life. So government supposed heal their better life with the online game. So our argument still stands.

And let me explain our second argument. Our second argument is charging money system. Charging money system. In the current situation, there are many people who use charging money system. It means that they change real money into virtual money so they can get the character or equipment or item and they can level up. And children using that system without permission of parents and also adults use this system as time as possible. And, in fact, if we stop their-- restrict time, they have many times for other things. So they can have another hobby or something. So they use money for other things. And online games will be our society problem, so government have to solve this problem. And they don't have end, so no one have to stop. And also, there many-- most of money to online games, so if they use money for other things, it may make better society [inaudible].Yay, [inaudible].

Okay. [inaudible] my name is [inaudible]. We believe the government shouldn't restrict the time spent on online game. Let me rebut government's first point. They spoke addicting. However, there are other [inaudible] that such a family, teachers and so on. And the company shouldn't step in domestic circumstance. Therefore, the argument doesn't stand.

Also, government's second point. They said--[inaudible]Sorry. Charging money. Charging money. However, the focus of this liberty, time. Time and not money. If we play online game for long time, it can collect-- sorry. Collect to charging money [inaudible] and the company promote not to charging too much money. So it is not problem.

Next, let me [inaudible] point. The smoke [inaudible]. However, the smoke is public [inaudible], but online game is not public [inaudible]. So the argument doesn't stand.

Then let me explain our second point. Sorry. [inaudible] of Japanese economy. [inaudible] of Japanese economy. Nowadays, most of people use a smartphone and plays online games for [inaudible] communicate with their friends. So the profit of the operating front for the company is very big. It means online game entertainment sustain Japanese economy. For example, in Korea, the government adopt the policy which restricts the time. Because they're not playing the game, 30% of game companies left from the industry, and it was a big damage for the government. If we have this policy in Japan, the nation's could create it, must not to play [inaudible]--[inaudible]. Please tell me about the Korean's case. Why we [inaudible] say that [inaudible]?I would [inaudible]. If we have this policy in Japan, the nation's [inaudible] must not to play it and the profit will disappear, and [inaudible] economy such that Korea government views. Okay.[inaudible].But only Korea adopt this now. So other countries' example is not there. Korea's policy is very similar style with Japan. So, thank you.

Thank you, chairperson. My name is [inaudible]. We strongly believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Let me summarize to this debate. The most important point is, what kind of effect restricting online games brings? What kind of effect restricting online games brings? Their first point was refer to the online game will always update it and there is no end, so it will prevent studying or the like. However, our [inaudible] rebutted by saying they didn't consider about taking therapy and stop addicting--[inaudible].No. So their first point is weak. And also, their second argument, people use money in online games and children pay moneywithout permission of parents. However, nowadays, we have a system that--Point of information.No, thank you. We have system that parents can get a permission or have a restriction, so their second argument doesn't stand. However, our argument is superior to their argument. Our first argument is about the right to freedom, and it is in the Japanese constitution. It's the top of the law. It is very strong, but if we adopt this plan the right of freedom will be invaded. And also citizen's independence will be lost. So--Point of [inaudible].No, thank you. So our first point is very strong. And also, our second point is [inaudible] Japanese economy because, for example, in the Korea restricted the online games using and 30% of company got damaged because citizens won't use money in the games. So it will have a bad impact on Japanese company. The company then is just so big in the Japanese economy, so our second argument is still standing very strong. Therefore we strongly believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games from the view of the effect of restricting online games brings. Thank you.

First of all, [inaudible] the government [inaudible] these Korean case, however that means in Korea, online game have on very hard for the citizens so the Korean government needed to limit the online. Yes. So [inaudible] that the online game, it's very hard for the [inaudible] and on second point, they are talking about only the child, only the children, however we are talking about other than--POI.--children. Sorry. And, first of all-- [inaudible] now people who are addicted to online games are [inaudible] now [inaudible] the online cannot find [inaudible] playing the online games [inaudible] so that problem is not [inaudible] problem for them and [inaudible] before. So if people can not control themselves, they are playing online themselves, the government need to take strong action to help them, to help their lives. So [inaudible] which is therefore people who play the online game.

On that point, we didn't say that if we ban the online games. We didn't ban online games.POI.Sorry. The citizens can still play online game but now they are playing so long, so really we should limit that. On that point, now as my partner mentioned before, many people are [inaudible] because of playing the video games because that unlimited [inaudible] the online game company always updates company new to make the users interested in that game. So the company didn't think that about-- didn't care about the citizen's [inaudible] life [inaudible]. For this reason, we support this motion. Thank you.