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Thank you, everyone. My name is [inaudible]. Today's topic is government should restrict the time spent on online games. So we define that [inaudible] really restrict more than 10 hours spent on online games-- 10 hours, more than 10 hours. Also, we define all ages-- all ages We have two points. The first one is-- sorry? The first one is online game addiction-- online game addiction. And the second point is stop paying money for games.

I'll explain the first point-- I'll explain the first point, addiction to online games-- addicted to online games. We believe that we should restrict the time spent on-- too much time on online games. Now, some people are addicted to online games and they spend too much time on the games. And this is very serious problem because they can't-- it will cause the lack of sleep time, and, as a student, they can't concentrate their class and their grades really go down, and after graduated, [inaudible]. And adult also can't work and concentrate. And so this situation have many bad points. For example, lost motivation of working and they will also lose communication skill. So [inaudible] situation [inaudible] according to so many dissertations. It's very important to combat the situation. So we should-- okay. Sorry?How can [inaudible]? How can Japanese government restrict that time?A way? There's a way. They can announce by their-- they have many ways. They can announce by TV or a newspaper or a [inaudible]. They restrict is very important. So, therefore, we should [inaudible]. Thank you.

Okay. Hello, everyone. My name is [inaudible]. We believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. [inaudible], in regard to what the government team said, they said government can reduce the time spent on online games by setting 10 hours-- more than 10 hours and also by, for example, announcement by TV. However, it is not always true because people who want to play online game or are living in a day while doing online games, cannot get out of the situation, and also they may depend on online games more. Therefore, their point is weak.

And let me explain our point. We have two points. The first point is bad for game society-- bad for game society. The second point is lost freedom-- lost freedom. I will explain the first point, bad for game society. Currently, many companies or people are involved in game society. For example, companies that are creating games, and YouTubers, who are doing the-- for example, who are doing running commentary. If government restrict their time spent on online games, their productivity or job will be decreased. Creating games costs a lot of money, and they spend much time to create or improve that game. So after taking [inaudible], the element for creating games will be slowed down. So game society cannot improve. So--[foreign]?No, thank you. And so, therefore, government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you. [applause]

Okay, thank you, Chairperson. My name is [inaudible]. The first reader, hello, everyone. We believe that the government should restrict the time spent on the online games. So let me revert to opposition's first point. So they say that it's bad for game society-- bad for game society. However, according to our definition, more than 10 hours be decreased restricted. So that we can save the heavy users in the online game so that we can save them and we can improve the skill of them. So the impact for the companies or enterprises or YouTubers is very small, and so that it can be covered with this situation. So the first point is very weak.

And so secondary, next we reconstruct government's first point. So they say that the-- so that our definition is very unclear, and so the restricting is not-- no use to the restricting. However, so please let me modify it-- the situation. So if people play games more than 10 hours, the screen of a TV can be restricted. So the program of this will be attached and get all of the games. So this situation can be [inaudible]. So it is not so serious problem. And okay.

So then, let me explain our second point. It is titled as Stop Paying the Money for Games-- stop paying money for games. We believe that nowadays, this problem is so serious that we should stop. For example, there is a case that children pay a lot of the money-- much money for the games. So during that their parents, they don't know. Okay.Are children playing more than 10 hours?Sorry?Are children playing more than 10 hours online games?Yes. Huh? Yes. So you mean that-- sorry. Please let me read it. And so, to develop in the game, we need a lot of time in this process. A lot of the people pay money. So in this situation, I had one friend who is a heavy gamer. So he pays a lot of the money for the games. And so his condition or the academic skill is variable. So our first point and second point is very strong. So to save the heavy users in games, it is very serious question and it is important point. So, therefore, [inaudible]. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. My name is [inaudible]. We believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Let me rebut government's second point. They say that children will pay more money. However, it is not always true because children actually have to go to school, and they don't have enough time to play online games. And also children have to-- children have to-- children will pay money by using their credit card, but they don't know that parent's credit card number to--Point of information. So we can pay that money for games used by the [inaudible] card. So we can purchase the [inaudible] card in the convenience store easily.But we can say that children can-- parents can restrict these situations by rules, by house rules. So we cannot--Point of information.Sorry. We cannot-- your second argument is weak.

And then, let me-- next, let me reconstruct opposition's first point. They said that impact for our country is-- impact for company is very small. However, it is not true because actually, for example, Nintendo has a very profit from Youtuber or other users. So also-- sorry-- heavy users will pay more money to this company. So it is a good effect on company. So your rebuttal is weak.

And then, let me explain our second point. The second point is lost freedom-- lost freedom. [inaudible] timetable is freedom for us because actually, to restrict timetable means restrict our freedom. Freedom is very important. It's very important to our life. And also, even if they have fun, it is their responsibility because government can't pay users physical and mental problems. And then, online game is very easy to way-- easy way to communication with other people such as foreigners. So to communicate with these people, they can play hobby. It's is a very good way to-- good for physical and mental for users. And after, there are people who have friends only in Internet. So we can't say that these people-- if this taken, one example, we can say that these people have possibility to commit suicide. It is a very big problem. So we should not take this from. Thank you. [applause]

Hello everyone, my name is [inaudible]. We think that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Let me summarize [inaudible]. The most important point is freedom for individuals, for example, company and person. And the [inaudible] don't have to restrict, and on this point, the idea is Japan can save heavy online games gamer. However, our argument is superior because please confirm this point. They defined that more than 10 hours and the way to restrict is announcement. Please imagine there is-- there is [inaudible] to-- please imagine, there is no impact because they can't play online games for more than nine hours and the restrict is easy to break. So the possibility that the regulation to be kept is very low. So the idea is not important. And on our point, all rights should be granted. Playing online games is one of the rights to freedom. Now, game reporter is one of the jobs. So after the plan-- sorry-- no, sorry. And there is a [inaudible] effect on games social economy. And please imagine, the idea's importance is very small because Japanese government don't have to take this [inaudible] away. The government-- please imagine, and as our second speaker's said, parents can restrict for the--Point of information.--sorry, for their children. So there is no reason to restrict by Japanese government. So we believe that Japan government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you, Chairperson. My name is [inaudible]. First, let me attack your second argument. So the second argument is we can communicate with foreigners, but it is not a good argument because, so, we want to communicate with face-to-face to foreigner. So through the screen, we can't understand the real meaning, and these words are very interpreted by the common languages. So they can't learn from the foreign words. And we have to communicate face-to-face and to learn their feelings. So, therefore, their argument is not efficiency and lack of impact.

So let me summarize this debate. So the most important point is, which is important for each people. So on this point, their first argument is damage for game society. So we want to say that ordinary people don't game over 10 hours. Therefore, all of people-- so all of people can't game users. Sorry? Therefore, game officers can't try to develop those products normally, even if follow this plan. Therefore, the first argument is weak and second argument is also I attack. However, so I want to say that addiction is very dangerous. So they already attacked that children can do over 10 hours, it is not true because, so, please imagine the case of Thursday and Sunday, we can game easily, and also, children is addicted. They can game easy because [inaudible] 4:00 PM to 2:00 AM. So it is very important. So they can game over 10 hours. And also, adult can easy to game over 10 hours more than easy. Therefore, addiction is very bad things because-- so, for the student, according to [inaudible] net addiction is hard to get back to the reality and education will get worse. It is very bad. And also, if all adult fall into that net addiction, this trend will-- behavior will tend to the next generation. So this vicious cycle is very-- I want to say that this behavior with bad effect for children and also children's health is very important. So therefore, our argument [inaudible] and their argument [inaudible]. Thank you.[applause]