Transcription details:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date: | 02-Mar-2018 |
| Input sound file: | (4-15)20170724214711.mp3 |

Transcription results:

Can I begin? Hello everyone. Nice to see all of you. Let's enjoy today's last debate. Okay. Today's motion is government should restrict the time spent on online games. Here, online game means that a game, something that-- when you pay money, the time of-- the time will be shortened, I mean, because they're Clash of-- for example, Clash of Clans. Let's take an example of Clash of Clans, which is a very famous online game. When you pay money to Clash of Clans, you can shorten the time that you have to wait. So this means that when you pay lots of money, you can play for longer time. And time restriction is three hours because we think that's the right time for it. Okay.

Let me move onto our first point. Okay.So, in this debate, your motion defines that what you call online games are only that you pay money?Wait, no. Okay. Let me move onto our points. Our first point is those who are not eager to play game can be-- quit playing. Second [inaudible] is-- economy effect. Okay. Online game, for example like Clash of Clans or [inaudible] are enjoyable and very fun and most of people are playing, but some people are not very eager to play. They are playing those games just because in order to make-- spend little time and have conversation with others. We [inaudible] time restriction of this. It's likely that they will be bored with this game and it's likely that they can quit, yet stop playing this game.POI.Okay.[inaudible]. I want to clarify. You mean that if you have a time restriction on playing free games, that means people who are not eager to play those online games will be bored?Okay. I will explain. Generally speaking of games, if you are to play game, you are to play long time, okay? For example, if you want to get some treasures, you want to play that until you can get it. However, after time restriction, you won't be able to play that game until you are satisfied. This means that you can't play game until you want to do. So this means that you can't do what you can do. This leads them to be bored to this game. Okay. So it can be said that this motion is very effective for those who is not very eager to play this game. And their time will be saved and they can do what they really want to do. So I think this motion-- and here's another example of this. I heard that, for example, FGO, which is a most famous software game is that they have only one person that pay lots of money and less than 99% don't pay lots of money. So then 99% of people will get bored and they will just quit [inaudible] play.

Hello, everyone. We believe that as the government side and as the opposition side, we believe that government shouldn't restrict the time spent on online game. Let me read what the government team said. And they said that, "If the government limits the time spent on online game then they cannot do things that they want to do as they spent much time on online." But online game can be a good way for another reason. I will explain later.

So let me explain our points. We have two points. The first point is that game can be a good studying tool. The second point is economic effect. But game is not only existed to entertain people, but game can be a good way-- can be a good tool for student to study. I'll explain the first point, game can be a good studying tool. We believe that games can be a good studying tool for students. These day in Japan, there is games like Mario Kart and Animal Crossing. I agree, they are--Point of information.--just a-- please sit down. And to entertain people. But on other hand, there are also games like memorization app that helps students to memorize. For some students, they prefer to study using those apps. If you limit the time of spending time online game, then you are also limiting the time of the students who want to study using those apps. For example, in my school, I have to remember [foreign] and they are so many [foreign]. So I can't carry my books all the time.Point of information.Please sit down. So if I used our apps, then while I'm going to school, on the train and the bus, I can use those apps to memorize [foreign]. That is a good way to study, isn't it?Point of information.Yes, please.Is that online game?Yes, it is because you use online to memorize [foreign].Okay, [inaudible].Please sit down. So then, students can study more efficiently. So therefore, we think that as the opposition side, government shouldn't restrict the time spent online. Thank you very much [applause].

Okay. Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm happy to see you all here. Now, as a second speaker, I would like to start with three things. First, I would like to attack your first point and second, I would like to reinforce our first point, then, I would like to introduce our second point. Now, in their first point, they said that some application can be used with your online teachers for students to study, yes? And however, we said in the definition that these online games are defined to be games that we pay money to shorten time. And such features do not appear in these online games so I don't believe that this point stands.

Now, but reinforcing our first point, force of habit. Force of habit means that being forced to enjoy one's habit, I mean hobby. And this is something that we do right. We did play games for fun. And not all people, not all people playing games play games for study. There are applications that are completely not for study and online games, not all of them are for studying.

Now, introducing our second point, economic effect which is, coincidentally, the same as yours. Now, the situation [inaudible]. These days, the time game players spend on online games is not restricted and game quest or achievements can be done with time. We can actually choose whether to spend time or spend money.Now, consumers can choose whether to pay money or wait. And as an example, I would like to introduce FPS, First Person Shooting game I am playing currently. Player can choose whether to wait, to receive, to revive from his desk or use items bought by money. This is example of such [inaudible]. Now, after the plan what will happen is that the time gamers spend on online games get restricted. That means that choice will not exist anymore, which means players are going to be forced to spend money. Now I would like to say this from another aspect different from our first speaker. If players have to spend money on items in order to continue playing and enjoy games or even study, this will lead to economic effect because using money on games increases money flow in society. Increased money flow benefits the whole economy and it will be good not only for individual but companies too. Yes sir?What is the first point and the second point? Can you say your first point and your second point?[foreign].Oh, okay. [inaudible] Okay. Well, about the economic effect, yes. Not only individuals but companies will receive the benefit of the increased money flow. And with game companies having more income, they will be able to provide more enjoyable games and more appropriate games. So this will benefit all of us and I think introducing this plan will be good as for the government's flow. Thank you very much. [applause]

Hello everyone. We believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Let me rebut government's first point. They said some people spend time playing time because they are boring but it doesn't always true. I'm sorry, there is not obvious answer. It doesn't make sense.

And as for government's second point, they said most of people pay money to save time. However, that's not always true and many people think money is important. It's a common point and if people spend money to shorten the time of the game to reach the goal, it will be like a gamble and they will be seriously addicted. It is very bad for us and our future.Point of information.I'm sorry.

Next, let me reconstruct opposition's first point. They said there is no connection between online games and studying. However, it doesn't make sense. We can use online games to study. It is very useful. If governments restrict the time spent on online games--Point of information.I'm sorry. People who want to study cannot study although even if they want to study strongly. It is very unfortunate. Many people think so, too.

And then let me explain our second point, bad influence on Japanese economy. Games is one of the most creative culture in Japan now and games are also enjoyed by people all over the world. And online games have big influence on Japanese economics and financial. Yes. Because many people buy the online games and they will enjoy the online games. If government restrict the time spent on online games, the online games will not be sold and decrease in sales. It has bad influence on not only economic but also other many things. Yes. Also, games is one of the very important culture in Japan.Point of information.We cannot ignore it. So we have duty to protect our culture for our future. And by not restricting the time, their amount of playing games will increase and the sales will rise. It is very important for our economics and society. Therefore, we believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you very much.

Hello, everyone. We believe that government should restrict the time-- no. They shouldn't restrict the time spent on online games. And first of all, I have something to say. At first, when I asked the leader of the government of the definition, if they include free games or not and he said yes to my POI. So I thought that what they define as online games are free games and not-free games that you pay money. So that's why we all thought that it includes free games and we did not understand the definition very well. Let me summarize today's debate. The most important point is economic benefits. On this point, their idea is by restricting at three hours, many people will spend more money to get to their goals where they want to end the game. And that way, they will spend more money on their games. However, our argument is superior. It's because, let's say you like a game and you have to spend money to play more. But if it's only three hours and many people will think, "If it's only three hours, then if we want to play more of the game, why do we have to spend so much money on it?" And maybe many more people will think that they shouldn't spend money on it and then they won't like the game because there are more free games that they can play without even spending money and they can go on on the next stage as much as they want, so, therefore, I think government shouldn't restrict this time spent on online games. Thank you. [applause]

Okay. I'll do my best. [applause] These days, games increasing in this world. And today, we're going to debate about whether games are good for-- good or not for both for debate, not debaters, gamers and the society. And first, I'd like to clarify our definition. Our definition of online games is a kind of entertaining games that encourages players to pay money by some ways. No, thank you. And next, I'd like to clarify the purpose of gamers. Why gamers do their games? Why gamers play games? They play games because they want to play. They pay money because they want to play much more. And, please, remember this one. Now, no, thank you. Now, I'd like to move up to their second point about the economic effect. So they said-- they were talking-- their reply speaker was talking about free games [inaudible]. They [inaudible] about the definition of free games [inaudible]. Then they're also saying about economic effects of mainly free games. We don't understand what is happening. In our second point, we're talking about economic effects which will be made by in-app purchases of free games. But they are mainly talking about games which are not initially free. And they were making a contradiction because they-- I don't really understand their second point, but anyway, we don't understand why economic effects will be a disadvantage for the society.

Anyway, let me move on to the comparison.POI.No, thank you. Let me move on to the comparison. First, I'd like to compare the key point. I mean, the economic effect in this debate. Okay, so, first, the second point, if we couldn't really understand the effect and even if what they are saying is true, our second point is much much [bigger?] if we compare the amount of effect. Our second point, in our second point, since gamers are eager to play games and play games, they will pay money.POI.No, thank you. But in contrast, their second point, in their second point, they said that the game is altered, and they said that games will not be so after the plan. However, we are not banning online games. We're just restricting the time of playing online games. So I can't understand the connection between time and the sales, because, as I said in the start of my speech, gamers are wanting to play games. So it is clear that they will buy-- they will do buy those kinds of games. So, in terms of economic effect, our point is fair. So for this reason, we believe that we want to restrict it. Thanks for listening. [applause]