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Hello, everyone. We defined the motion as follows. Online games are those kinds of games such as Pastora or the Sims. And in current trend, these games require players to pay money. For example, in Pastora as example, the [foreign]. That kind of things. And we have two points. So first point is to say-- to increase the-- to save individual, to save citizen. And second point is the benefits for society.

I'm going to explain first point. In the present situation, some people are suffering from spending too much time in online games. That's why they are less likely to use their physical ability or less likely to go out and play outside. Or less likely to pay money without think or without hesitation. Why is the--POI. POI.--[crosstalk] is occurred. Okay? Okay.Okay. Why are you-- you can say that people pay money unintention--Unintentionally. The reason? Because they are more likely to be addicted. By using games, they can-- because by using games, they can become pleasured in games. For example, when they are clear games, they can get point or they can get coins. So they can gain more pleasure in online games. And without this pleasure, those people can't be [inaudible]. That's why even if they think they will stop games tomorrow, they can't do. Because they can get pleasure in those of online games. And they can't be calm without such games. And also, in particular children-- they are more vulnerable or they are more tendency to be too much concentrated in online games and more likely to pay money without thinking. And also online games are made to be more addictive by companies. That's why this situation has occurred and why this situation is serious. Because of individual level, they are more likely to have disease or addiction, or they are likely to pay more money. And also the government level-- they can't take responsibility to improve citizen health. However, after taking this plan, those people are less likely to spend too much time in online games. So that's why they have to use extra time in other things. Then they are more likely to find pleasure not in online games, such as playing outside kids or playing or doing studying or debating. That's why this restriction is important. And why this restriction is important because they are less likely to be addicted and less likely to pay money. That's why we are very proud to propose. Thank you.

So, thank you, chairperson. My name is Yamadata Ya. So hi, everyone. We believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. First, let me debate what the government team said. They said that there are some people who are paying money without thinking, however they didn't show why there are people-- why there are people who are paying money without thinking. So their [crosstalk]--[crosstalk] information, because they are more likely to pay money without thinking, they are more likely to gain pleasure from the--For example?No.You have evidence? Okay, thank you. So also they set up children can be calm after playing their smart phone games, however it doesn't stand because children can get more excited by playing games so their reason doesn't stand.

Next, let me explain our points. We have two points. Our first point is what's the right about, what's the right about? And our second point is, huge damage to the Japanese economy, huge damage to the Japanese economy. So now I'll explain our first point. What's the right about? First we have to think about why people feel like playing online games. There are some [inaudible] in Japan, bring power harassment, sexual harassment and so on. Those are stress for all people that are living in Japan. So this stress, what can we do? Almost all people play games, that is because everyone has its own smartphone and game with them and we can start bringing easy, more easy. So we can say, "Games are good and appropriate things for releasing the stress, better than sports that costs money." So as I said-- and today people in Japan has been [inaudible] because a lot of trouble. The most serious problem we have to think about is discrimination and society and drink. Yes, if holding these problems they feel sick and they will commit a suicide-- there's a possibility to commit a suicide. For these peoples, games become place that is safe for them. Yes, so most important thing is-- also I want to say that other most important thing is happiness. What's the right about? It's pursuing happiness. It's written in constitution that the purpose of right is pursuing the happiness, right? So this [inaudible] can be changed because of all the reasons and we strongly believe that our government should not restrict our time spent on online games. So our first one is what is right about, what is right about? And our second point is, huge damage to the Japanese economy. That's all, thank you.

Okay. Let me serve my speech. Firstly, I will reconstruct our first argument. They said that why there's people are paying without thinking and I will give one example. For example, the games contain sexual, graphic contents that's based on human's fundamental desire, so therefore we can't decide without thinking. So that's the one example because it's based on human's fundamental desire like desire for eating, something like that.

And I'll adapt to their first argument. They said that the way of getting--[inaudible]. POI.No, thank you. As the way of getting rid of stress, playing games and give pleasure from such games is justifiable. However, this is not true and this shouldn't be justifiable. Because if they admit this point that the way of getting rid of [inaudible], we can also admit using the drugs or alcohol-- drugs as the way of getting rid of stress for pleasure. But in this world, using drugs is not admitted because, I think--POI.No, thank you. Maybe we can use them as a way of getting rid of stress but it's based on the rationality of people. That's why government should intervene not to use drugs. But the same thing can be said in this debate about online games, because, as our first speaker said, online games is made by the company to be the character of addictive one. And that's the reason why the government must intervene on restricting the time spent on online games.

Now let me move to our second argument. Our second argument is on existing games which is not harmful for players. So in the current situation, since companies make games which drive game players addictive, people get addicted and games sell very much. But that won't cause a problem-- company won't make efforts to create the online games which is not addictive-- which is not addictive for the game players. And game players are suffering from unhealthy conditions as our first speaker already mentioned. However, after taking this plan, addictive online games will not sell because time restriction make players not to play such games much more and they will search for another game that government doesn't restrict, because such game players want to play games no matter what kind of games they are. So they won't search online games which restrict the time spent. So that leads to creating games which attract players and not addicted one. And for that reason, we're very proud to propose this motion.

Thank you, Chairperson. My name is [inaudible]. And hello, everyone. We believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Let me rebut government's first point. They say it's to save citizens. First, let me mention that their first point and their second point is attacking each other. This is because on their second point, they're saying to get another game, but on the first point they're saying to save citizens because they-- to reduce the game time, but--One information. I said in the second argument that the games which is not addictive, in this point it's not harmful for the game players.Why? Can you explain it? Why?Because it's not addictive one.Why is it not addictive? Can you explain later? Okay. And also, if they have less time doing online games, they would spend more money because they have no time to get what they want on their games, and so there would be more money spent-- so it won't be saving the citizens.

As for government's second point, they said, "Benefit for society." I should mention there won't be a benefit on the health of the citizens and also it's addicting. So companies are doing the same thing, so it won't be a benefit for the society. Next, let me reconstruct opposition's first point. What is life about? They said that it's same to drugs and all that, but does game have an effect as the drugs and as alcohol and all that? They don't have the same exact effect. And they don't have harm-- they're not as harmful as drugs, so you can't say that and you can't prove that it is the same thing.

Then let me explain our second point, huge damage to Japanese economy, huge damage to Japanese economy. We believe that government is restricting the online game means to make the online game stop going abroad and stop it domestic. This would mean Japanese online game company can't get their game introduced in all the foreign countries, so their benefit from people playing the game will decrease. Game industries takes a big part in Japanese economy and industries. We can say this because a worldwide game company such as GameCon have been evaluated and are getting a benefit because they are international. So this plan will mean breaking Japanese game industries and the Japanese economy. Let me explain why the game needs to stop on domestic. This is because, if you make a time limit in the game-- or if you make a time limit in the game, then it means you can't access it from international countries or foreign countries. Or if you cut the Internet or something, then this will mean many people can't use it on other things, so this will be a big problem too. Thank you.

Thank you, chairperson. My name is Jin Kurosawa. Let me summarize today's debate. The most important point is what they like. On this point, there are other ways we have to-- there are other things, like sports or study, and game players will suffer by game companies as their first [inaudible], but they didn't show the actual evidence. However, our argument is superior because the Japanese game industry is very famous around the world. For example, Capcom, Nintendo, and so on. If we restrict it, Japanese key industry will decline from this serious problem, and so [inaudible] to what we want to do each other. So, if government restrict that someone [inaudible] to do the game, that person may be sad and playing game is so good for mentally because we can remove the stress and because it is exciting. And I thought that how about Mario in the smart game? It is not charging money [inaudible] not existed charging money. So to kind of [inaudible] of charging money or not, if we use the not charging money, it is not a [inaudible] to our economy so it doesn't [inaudible] and game industry's good for Japanese economy and we need it because it is key industry in Japan. Therefore our government should not restrict time spent on online games. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, in this debate the subject is the government and the [inaudible] that should. So we should discuss the value debate, not the-- in this parliamentary debate, we should discuss the value of the why those of the procedure can be justifiable, a necessity, and [inaudible] itself. So those of the evidence-- that can't be the reason to deny about the point and, moreover, their second point, economic disadvantages for the Japan-- there is no mechanism-- there is no evidence they're using. So we consider this second point, [inaudible] to this value debate, ladies and gentlemen. And, yes, I'd like to explain why we should restrict online games as like the drugs. Ladies and gentlemen, the online games intend to make the citizen rational state of mind by the human intention. So that is why the government have to intervene to solve this problem, ladies and gentlemen. So what is the linkage of the drugs there said. However, this drug in online game, the structure is same because it will make the people irrational. So, in that case, the government have to intervene this problem, to mitigate the problems, and we are not saying to ban the game, existence of the game itself, ladies and gentlemen. That is a point and that is the reason why the drugs are restricted in the first place, ladies and gentlemen. That is our simple principle coming from our point. And I'd like to compare today's debate by using one [inaudible] point which model [inaudible] for players. A second speaker explained that the company will make the game much healthier to-- those corporate effort would be made after taking this plan. So in that case, our model that we want to solve [inaudible] for in an addicted state of mind, can be solved in our model, but they don't show us any counter model to solve this problem. So at least the situation will be better. So, for that reason, we're very proud to propose. Thank you.