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Thank you, Chairperson. Hello, everyone.Today's topic is people should have a microchip implant in their own body. We define the motion as [inaudible]. Microchip can be used for all services such as credit card, passport, and train ticket. We have two points. The first point is prevent hacking. The second point is convenience.

I will explain the first point. Prevent hacking. We believe that we can avoid to be abused [inaudible] their valuable such as credit card, money, because people cannot take microchip from their body because microchip is in their hand and people will not be storing their important things. Also, microchip can use only theirself who have their microchip. It mean bad people cannot use other people's microchip. This is good point too. Microchip. But people cannot use other people's things, so we can avoid bad situation, and people-- Also if we have microchip, people don't need to take many cards, so we can prevent to lost their valuables and credit card, and sometimes in the past, many people have train ticket to go their high school or university, then some people lost their cards, but if we use microchip, we can prevent these things. Also, we can use a passport for-- We can use microchip as passport. Passport have many individual informations, so if we wrote them, it is very dangerous. Also, Japanese passport is very valued, so if we lost them, bad people will sell in expensive cost, so to prevent these things, people should not have a microchip-- People should have a microchip implant in their own bodies. Thank you.

Hello, everyone.We think that people should not have a microchip implant in their own bodies. They said a great situation, in [their defense?] that a microchip have in their hands, but we think if that people who have microchip in their hands can't use, will become-- can't use their hands or some hand, they can't become-- they become can't use that microchip. And also the government side says that there are all information, [in visual?] information so, on the other hand, if that all information will lost by other people, it is very dangerous for that people, so it is bad. So it is not strong reason that we think--[inaudible].Yes?Is there any cases that those chips were stolen?Sorry?Is there any case that the chips were stolen?So we don't think-- Sorry, we don't have that case of that situation, but there is some risks for that situation, so we mustn't overlook that risk.

[inaudible] [screened out?] for in two points, first risks, risks. And second point is [essays?]. I will explain the first point. The first point is risks. There are a lot of problems caused by having a microchip implant in their own body. First, having a microchip implant in their bodies has just been on two people, so we can't know all problems brought by doing this, for example--[inaudible].Yes?Don't you think that if people start to put a microchip, people will start to learn the risk or the convenience?But it is just-- it has just been invented and known to the people, so people can't know about all problems, so there are so many problems at risk, for example, infection disease have already been caused, and according to the data, it is that they are on the same risks as tattoo, but we mustn't overlook that risks, if the risks are very little. Second, there are security programs which give examples of [caseworker?] stop their functions when we use smartphones. Just like this it probably stop their functions, it maybe will become serious situation for the people who have microchip in their bodies. Thank you for listening.

Thank you, Chairperson, I'll start now. And firstly I'll talk about how there anyone is-- So about their first point says that there is a risk that there will be stolen and cause disease, however they also mention that the disease, the risks for the people's health is same as the tattoo, and they didn't show us how significant the risks, so that the tattoo-- There are many people around the world who have tattoos in their body, but have you heard that some people died because of the tattoo? So you haven't, maybe. Like there is not a significant risk for their health, so their point doesn't stand at all, and also--[inaudible].No, thank you. And also that there is a risk that people might not-- they want to be able to be able to use their [high quality?] properly, however people be around by adapting the proposition, adopting this proposition and before they implant the microchip, they will be explained by the doctors or some professionals, so there is no risk for the—

So next, I will talk about how our point one [inaudible] and they rebut us by saying that there will be a risk to be stolen or robbed, however, as our prime minister says that there is a few risk. There is a less risk that will be stolen because if we have our plastic card or some cards, they might be stolen because they are not in our body but the outside of our body. However, if it is on our inside of our bodies, it hard to be stolen so it can [inaudible]-- It hard to stolen, right? So it is difficult to be stolen so thereby our point still stands.

Our second point is that cost. If the microchip implant in our own bodies, we need not bring many things, for example credit card, wallet and other devices. For example, we have many payment too, so we have to discover one card or bill and more in our wallet. It wastes time, however if we're paying many [other places?] to microchip, many customers can buy things more faster, therefore Japanese many kinds of economy will be better more than now, so our point is second.[inaudible].Thanks you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that people shouldn't have a microchip implanted in their own body, and first of all, let me rebut a government first point. We heard that they said it will prevent risk of hacking, but however, if we use it, we think we still have the risk. For example, if we use the microchip in our hands, and a criminal know, "Oh, he have a microchip in his hand," the criminal can cut his hand and get the microchip very easily. And also--[inaudible].No, thank you. And also a criminal can cut or remove it, so we'll still have dangerous. And also, maybe microchip-- if microchip connected with the internet, internet is very dangerous place, we can say, and if the cyber crime will happen and internet criminal who using internet can take our money or whatever.[inaudible].No, thank you.

And second, as for government second point, they said it is very convenient, but we don't think we have a problem now by using a wallet or just a paper money, therefore--[foreign]. So if we waste our money, it can't be [inaudible]--Get back.--get back, however there is a system that bank will get back the money to the victim, so how do you think about the system? There is a system that bank will pay back the--Pay back the money.--pay back the money, so how do you think about the system?Pay back the money.So like, there is no system that-- there is a system that can't be--Sorry, we don't have time for that.

Okay. I will explain the second point. The second point is needless in today's society. First imagine trying to say our society is inconvenient to spend ordinary, right. This answer is maybe no, because-- no thank you. Because we can't spend our ordinary right, and so we don't have to take such a big risk, which our first speaker said, so it is needless to implant in the people's body. And with me summarizing my point, so there is no use to implant in the such machine or in the body, and our first speaker said a lot of risk and our world is enough convenient and safety, so we have to protect the convenient and safety [balance?], so our world is enough convenient and safety, so we don't have to implant the microchip in our body. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. Let me summarize today's debate. What we are talking about is which is more useful and safety for our world to allow us to have a microchip or not. And however, for the point, we said there is a risk and it is needless in today's society. And they said prevent hacking inconvenience. However, the argument is not strong. They said passport or train ticket or credit card contain in the microchip. It is true, and it might be useful, but more and more information contain, more and more higher risk involved. They said a few risk to be stolen, however even now, there are incident that people are killed in order to get the information. We can easily expect that people's body are able to get the information. Then, let me explain what we should win this evening. First of all, this implanting microchip system has started this century. It is created ordinary people don't have much information about it, even the scientists haven't done enough research. And they said do you know some people who are killed by tattoo, but I don't know about it but research isn't have done enough, so we can't say that the possibility is still-- Even though we even don't know how huge this involved system, it is obvious that it is too dangerous to allow this system. In addition, it is completely needless to call into situation. When microchips are implanted in people's body, our life might be more useful than now. It is true, however, still in a [global?] and in [inaudible] situation, do we really need such system to see a reason to implant microchip? We already can lead useful life. There is no meaning to implant microchip in spite of involving high risk. Microchip isn't so useful system in spite of high risk. Therefore, we strongly believe that we should win. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that people should have a microchip implant in their own bodies. First, let me rebut opposition's second point. They said the current situation is enough, however, they didn't mention any disadvantage of implanting a microchip. So they only mentioned one disadvantage, so their opposition's second point doesn't explain any disadvantage.

So then I will summarize today's debate. The most important point is that microchips is better than today's technology or not. On this point, their idea is that criminals also can steal their microchip and they can cut their hands and steal chips, however, do all criminals kill people to get a card? Isn't it easier to take a card from somebody's pocket? So the crime will be more harder by implanting a microchip, so their point does not stand. And also, no thank you. And also they said that they don't know how dangerous microchip is, so they didn't show what kind of disadvantage, what kind of risk that microchip has properly, so it means that they couldn't show how dangerous the microchip is. However, our argument is superior. It is because we clearly showed that microchips has many advantages and it's more safer than the today's technology. The crime will be more harder and they will-- the crime will be more harder, and it's hard for criminals to steal those datas or microchips. So it means that microchips are more safer than the today's technology.[inaudible].No, thank you. And also mention that the convenience of microchips that by improving microchips, not only the people's inconvenience, but also that a function of society will be better, so it means that therefore we strongly believe that people should have a microchip implant in their own bodies. Thank you.