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Mr. Speaker, firstly, I'm going to define this motion as follows. First, we will decide the time of the restriction with advice of the doctors and the players of the game will get the warning before the restriction.PI.No, thank you. So my first argument is that harm on people in short-term. And our second argument is that harm on people in long-term.

So I will talk about the harm on people in short term. So what kind of bad effect will happen on people in short term? We think that there will be the bad effect on their health. So for example, in their career some game player who spent too much time on the computer game died with the heart disease. So it is because that he doesn't move at all and he is on the economy class disease such as the airplane disease. And also there will be the bad effect of the work or the studies so that the people may spend too much time on the games so they can't concentrate on their works or their studies.So why the bad effect happen if people play games? So firstly, the people can stop playing the game if you want to study. So for example, there is the system called the Gacha of which stir up the gambling spirit of the people or there will be the event which take time to gain some kind of item which will contribute in the game. So they can't stop once they start it.And secondly, they don't know the risk or the dangerousness of the game at the first point. It is because they don't get any warning from the game company about the dangerousness of the game so that they don't make any rational decision in order to stop game. We believe that it is-- for example, we think that it is the same thing with the drug. The drug is that we don't know that it's dangerousness. It is hard to know the dangerousness of the drug at first. And if you once start drug, it is hard for you to stop it. So end of-- so that we should give people the strength needs to stop those kind of bad effect on the people. Thank you.

Thank you for chairperson. And hello ladies and gentlemen? We believe that government shouldn't restrict the time spent on online game. Let me read back the government team said. First, the definition is, "We can understand because, say, it's a time of doctor advice, but there are no evidence on how long. It's not there. So if please you want to define the days, please say how long''. So they said health becomes worse. However, it's a case of a few people. So ordinary people, it's okay, can stop. In fact, my friends play video game a long time but say he stopped. It's not only one friend. I have many. And furthermore, and you said the game is gamble. However, horse race and pachinko are the same things. So please think and go horse race people. So it's--Your point?No. They can't stop gamble. So if continue you can stop people, it's only little. So it's not a big problem, we think.

Next, let me explain our point. We have two points. The first point. It's connected to love of individual freedom. The second point. Japanese economy gets worse. I will explain the first point. It's going to rob our individual freedom. Please read Race Game. Buy book. You like to read that book. If you are ever to read a book, what do you feel? I think you feel sad or angry. It can say--That one?Yes.We believe that there will be no harm with the books. But we believe that, as I said in the last debate, we have great many harms in the game. So what do you think of that?So read a book is a seriously harm, so for example dry eye. It's a look a long time, it's become a disease. So please let me. In addition, if you play video games a lot, you can be a sports player. Do you know e-games? It's a famous sports game in the world. For example, Tekken, and Pokemon, and so on. So furthermore, it will be a Olympics game in 2024. So if we say that get time of playing game, it's connected to rob a chance to participate in Olympic games 2024. Therefore, we believe government shouldn't respect the time spent on online games. Thank you.

So, Mr Speaker, so we going speak, opposition side for today. Firstly, they have asked us to present the length of the hour that we allow, so we will say 1-2 hours. Then, for secondly, they have provided some rebuttals to something about gambling spirit. And then we are trying to say-- we would say the thing, such as Pachinko and horse racing, does not have any health problem. For that reason, their argument does not stand for this [inaudible].POI.No, thank you. Then, finally, they have provided their argument on sports-related games. However, the main example that they have provided is not an online game, and secondly, there are not a lot of sports-related games in the society that we have. So the case that they're talking about is really small case that's being presented in this [crosstalk]. For that reason, gaming related to sports just is not relevant a lot to this debate.

Then, going on to my first argument which is the illustration of the huge influx of individuals escalating in terms of gaming. So firstly, they start to game online, and secondly, they get addicted to gaming. Why is that? Because gaming has some state of addiction. And the idea that there's no way to go out from those addictions, and then they are irrationally making their choices to play the game. So with that reason, we do believe that they do require the government's help in order to get out from those cycles that cannot stop the gaming system. And then also, as there's no way to go out from this bad cycle, there will be harm for themselves and other players of the game for their city.And then, for that reason, we believe that, as they are addicted to gaming, they will not be able to contribute to society. Why is that? Because they will spend their time on gaming, not working or not on education. And so it is that reason we believe that they cannot-- it's impossible for them to contribute to society, which means that for that reason, they will not pay enough tax in order to sustain our society. And also, as the leader of the government has said, there will be a house problem for this problem. So with that reason, they will waste a lot of money on social welfare that we are paying onto individuals who play the game. Just because those individuals playing games just irrationally. As a government, we are asked to waste a lot of money on social workers in order to treat--- in order to get them their health system. For that reason, we are very happy to remove that [inaudible].

Thank you.

Thank you, chairperson. I'm Polly [inaudible]. We believe that government shouldn't restrict the time spent on online games. Let's read what government said. They said the effect of a short time and a long time. For the short time, they said it is bad for health. However, it's not always true. We can't say doing games directly influences people's health, and if government restrict, people will not stop games Most people, people who use time too much for games, have a serious mother for real lives. So we should care about people who spend too much time for games before government restrict their time spent on online games.Your point?No.

Next, they said doing games too much is the same thing as drugs. People who do online games so much time can't stop themselves. But then I wonder, if government restrict, do they really stop doing games? I think no. How can government restrict completely? We can do online games by using many code, many account, and anywhere anytime. So the government cannot restrict doing online games completely.

And the second point comes from they say doing online games too much is not useful for society. However, there is no evidence so it does not matter.

Next, let me read some of opposition's first point. We think that doing Pachinko is doing by sickening too. So the effect for our body is the same as the case for not doing games. And you say it's small case too, but in reality it is exist. Therefore, our argument is superior.

Then let me explain our second point. Japanese economy must be getting worse. The time spent on online game is restricted, it means game companies income is decreasing because if people can't do online games--Your point?No-- freedom, people can't do it enough they want, and game company get income by about same cost, paying money for improved game skills. However, if people can't do enough, game company's income is decreasing. Then--Your point?No. Someone is fired, some company will go flop. Therefore, government shouldn't restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you.

Thank you, chairperson, and hello everyone. We believe that government should not lessen or restrict the time spent on online game. Let me summarize today's debate. The most important point is necessity of restrict. Of this point their idea is online game makes Japan worse. However, our argument is superior. It is because the restrict of time or money is not necessary. Why government being particular? of our freedom? Playing game is our right. Does games makes a bad effect to government? I think no.The first thing which seems to happen by game, at the root, had another reason. For example, increase the number of needs. This cause isn't game, but also best motivation for work. Furthermore, about healthy, online game just improve to eyesight. Now, violence isn't included with game. Now violence isn't involved with game. Why government should restrict online game contradiction to economic because of system of choices.Your point?No. The company of games development connects the world economy development. Ultimately, online game makes Japan economy better. Game is one of the best Gacha in Japan which is popular all over the world. A lot of people enjoy it. Why government restricted it? Therefore, we believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online game.Your point?No. Thank you for listening and your cooperation.

Okay. So as far as [inaudible], I gave up their argument. So they say it about e-sports but e-sports [inaudible] is addictive at €8 a month and expense to all. Game Hero also make it difficult to leave game because player [inaudible]. This is important problem. And the e-sports [inaudible] is not the important problem. And then coping is game difference.So game is danger and we can stop hobby but game rob of us our ability to judge. This is very important and what they say about Pachinko also. But the mostly big problem is game using gambling by keep player. And being depressed, they can't stop. Then the harm is being passed. So this is the most important problem. And then, they say economic bad effect, but game company which make unhealthy game shouldn't be selected. And by this motion, game company will change their soul and they will make healthy game. So this is many. And so [inaudible] but it's not, sorry, and then [inaudible] last point is government still need to nation's health. So let's think about the game player. The government say the right is important but it best on the ability to normal judge. So if we did restriction, they can't stop the game because they don't have the ability to judge normal. And then their health may be bad and they--PI.Sorry. They lose the way to write the exact game. So then the society increase of people who don't work is important and for the gamers have bad effect also. So government maybe use the game because we don't have other way to change this situation. So because gamers don't have ability to judge enough, so we should do this motion. So maybe it may give incentive. Thank you.