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Hello, ladies and gentlemen in this house. Today we have the motion that government should restrict the time spent on online games. First, I would like to explain the definition, limit the players who play over five hours to three hours at least. Today, we have two points. First, by restricting the time, people can do their own task. Two, health problem. Health problem.

So let me explain my first point. I think government have the responsibility to make society better and better. Long time player is very [trash?], and government should clean them, so society can become better and more good. Generally speaking, city grow old just as people do. For example, if someone who only play games and don't work, and pay that cost by their parents. Do you think they give benefits to society? I don't think so. If they stop playing games and government make them two hours to work, they can provide benefit even it is small. But they actually provides a benefits to society. And if they began to work, even game even become more funny for them, because they will know the interest of their life. And therefore, I support this motion. Thank you for listening. [applause]

Thank you, chairperson. Hello everyone.We believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Let me [inaudible] what the government team say. They said government has responsibility for good society. However, it is not the responsibility of government. Certainly, we want to make good society. But it is personal problem whether we play or not play. Therefore, your opinion is not to true.

Next, let me explain our points. We have three points. The first point is we must [crosstalk]--Even it is private problem, but if a game company has many money from them. And I think if this money wouldn't go to the company, they go to the order--Can you ask questions?Thank you. I will explain the first point. We must restrict the time ourselves for the future. We believe that we must restrict our time to play the online games, because we should manage our time ourselves in the future, and we must have something that we should do. For example, [almost?] students must study hard, and many adults should make money after [inaudible]. And there is difference between-- we can restrict ourselves and we can restrict with another regulation, so it is not the same. Therefore, we should manage our time ourselves, and government should not restrict the time spent online games. Thank you. [applause]

Thank you Madam Speaker. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen in this House. In my speech, I will do refutations and argumentations. Let me explain one by one. Firstly, previous speaker said playing the online games is personal problem, so it don't connected with our society, but this is not true. For example, when we stay up late by playing the online games, we can't concentrate on studying or working. This behavior become [caught but?] society, so I think government should restrict the time spent on online games.

Second argumentation, my argument is about our [general?] health. Playing games hurt our health. For example, [inaudible] screen long time, our eyes become wrong. In addition too, when we stay up late to play online games, we can't concentrate on studying or working. If government restricts the time spent on online games, we can protect our health. If people have their health, our society must become better in case of rationality and convenience. In conclusion, I believe this motion is true. Thank you.I'm sorry, but please explain again your-- the part for our first point, simply.Previous speaker said to playing the video game is personal problem. So good society is not always our behavior.

Thank you chairperson. We don't believe that government should restrict the time spent on online games. First, I debate what the governments [side said?]. They said people who play games don't work and don't pay tax. However, do you know people who get money by playing the game? For example, YouTuber is take a video playing the [inaudible] game.I first define, to limit the players who play over five hours, at least three hours. And most YouTubers, there's a little-Can you prove--Not too many.Sit down when you finish the question, pleaseAnd to make society-- and they don't--Okay. Thank you. Maybe they can't prove YouTubers-- people who earned by [carrying?] conquest of the game, but don't play game over five hours, so their opinion's weak.

So the second point said that it's health problem, but people don't do game interest their body, have a health problem. We can control ourselves, so [all those?] people can control how they play the game.

Next, let me debate-- no, reconstruct our past point. We said personal problem, so if we tell by my mom, example, don't game over five hours. I'm seeing always, we can don't do that, but if we ask who, say that. But it's not always seen, we think, so somebody don't do that. So it has no problem, and don't have the government do that.

I'll explain our second point. Second point is, it's about problem of economic side. It's going without saying that the company developing online games can be proportioned to using by people, and in fact, there are some people to play long, long time, and governments sometimes say it is bad for their [health?]. But it is also part that companies' earnings, thanks to amount people playing games, this problem is not such an easy problem enough. [applause] Government-- just judgment. So we disagree with this opinion. Thank you very much. [applause]

Thank you, chairperson, and hello everyone. We believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Let me summarize today's debate. The most important point is, this policy might be to the interest for the [first?]. However, it is both for a better future of Japan and our society. On this point [inaudible], it is about a [inaudible], healthy, and we have to make good society. However, [inaudible] is barrier because we say before then, it has no active result with help of other person. We have to live by a [world?] power in the future. If we make this policy, this ability can grow. Also, we said before, online games' income is connect-- or government income. For example, it is income tax. Also, [almost?] workers play online games at [inaudible]. For example, committing time. So it's not about economy. If we want to make good society, we have to [inaudible] economy power. Therefore, government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you for listening. [applause]

Thank you, miss speaker. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen in this house. As reply speaker, I will summary this debate. Before doing the summary, I have heard what previous speaker say. Previous speaker said that we have online game economic power, but I think it is not true. Government side say, player who play long play short. Second, all [inaudible] is protect by restricting the time. Opposition side says-- also in the future, [almost?] students study hard. Second, company can develop because many people play long time games. For example, a [inaudible] and charging money gamer, they have common understanding long time. When I was a child, I loved games. Every day, I played games for about 10 hours, and I can study, so therefore, I think government side win this debate.Did you say, for my second opinion why online games-- economic growth-- why my second point-- can't say [always?].Thank you.