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Hello, everyone. Today's topic is Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. We define the motion as follows. The money that the country earned will be used for people. POI. No thank you. We have two points. The first point is-- Point of information. No thank you. Sorry. For the person really need it. For the person really need it. The second point is for the future. For the future.

Let me explain the first point, for the person really need it. Now many people age to 70 are applying, so it they can work. So we should use money for-- we should money which is spent of, for example, about 65 to 70 people, people who really needs it. POI. Yes?You said elderly people can work. However, elderly people can't do it as well as younger generations. For example, the [inaudible] [gentlemen's?]--. So the next speaker will explain. So who really needs money now? For example, we can't enter all the people's homes. So government can use the money on-- use money for people who really needs. Or working is good for elderly people for their health. For example, keeping their strength, or [dementia?]. In Japanese means [inaudible]. So if Japan raise the pension age to 70 years old we can use money effectively. So Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that Japan should not rise the pension age to 17 years old. Let me rebut what the government team said. They said government use money for people who really need, and working is good for elderly people. And rising by 17 will be [inaudible]. But the argument is not describable, so we cannot understand deeply.

And so next, let me explain our points. We have two points. The first point is the distribute per person the amount of money who have each people will be decreased from now. And second point is enjoy less-- POI. --life - no thank you - later. POI. Sorry. Let me finish our speech, please. So I will explain the first point. The first point is about distribute. And nowadays, population of elderly people is kept increase so many times. So now there is-- it is now social is said [foreign] in Japanese. So if the age of the pension will be increased distribute from 17. So the distribute per person will be increased. So almost elderly people will be poor and have not enough to life for food budget, or life budget, or something. So it is rise the level of 17 will be make Japanese social more worse. And so that because of they're poor the family who can stay warm for 18, for 65 years old people, family should be after health the family over 17 years old. It would be also would be a really burden with their work and health. So therefore, Japan should not rise the pension age to 17 years old. That's all. Thank you.

So we believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 17 years old. So, I'm sorry, maybe you guys didn't hear our definition. So I'll say the definition again. The total amount of the money the elder person will get won't change. So let me rebut opposition's first point. They said the elderly people will get poor. But, however, we'll explain in our second point. But those things won't happen because if the 70 years old people will work, they can earn money by themselves. And, I guess that's a really good thing, plus they can eaern the money by themselves. So-- POI. I'm sorry. So I think that's not a huge problem.

Next, let me reconstruct government's first point. They said for the person who really needs. So we're not talking about the elderly people, but there's also really sick people, or who can't get enough money because they are kind of, like they couldn't get enough work or anything. And we think there is a lot of people who can still work, healthy, and they can still work over like 60 years old. And we think we should give the money-- should we just spend the money for the person who really, really needs, right now. So, well, we think who are the person really needs?

And then let me explain our second point, for the future. So right now we are in the aging society right now. And for the aging society, the reason why we are facing this problem is because there are less kids right now. So we think right now it's up to 65 years old. But if we put it up to 70, there will be a five years' gap. And the five years' gap can make a lot of money. So then we think you should use those money to like make more-- like help the kids, help the mothers, help even the babies. So then, the older generation can make more money and then they can help the elderly people who is over 70, or even who are sick and stuff. So we think we should-- we thinking the aging society right now. So we think by using those five years' gap, we believe that we should use this extra money for the younger, so that the whole society, not just young or just old, both can live in a happy life. So and, for example, in my school, there is a teacher who is in my chemistry class. He is over 60-- over like 50 years old, so he can retire. But he still works for us and he's really, like he's really smart and like he is really experienced. So that's why we think elderly people have a lot of experience and they really-- POI. I'm sorry. He really teach a lot of time. So that's why-- [inaudible] think that elderly people are really suited, because they can teach the younger people. Okay. [inaudible]. The system of, excuse me, rework in a school is really not right example for other society can-- other society knows, but know the [inaudible] public work, like a teacher. Okay. Okay. So maybe that teacher example is not good. But we still think that even companies, even the elderly people can teach the younger ones how to talk with people, how to make good presentations and stuff. So we think Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to the 70 years old. Let me reconstruct our first point, distribute. They rebut according to their definition that which states that the pension for each person will not be changed. But their definition is out of that fact. So there are no-- less meaning to-- there are no-- sorry, there are no-- it's difficult to say so. Let me [inaudible] this [inaudible].

So let me rebut our first and second points. Let me rebut their first and second point. Their first point is we should give money to the people who really need it.

And the second point is for the future. At first, we need to rebut their first point, really need it. They said that we should give money for [inaudible] needed person. But the elder people are also who really need it. POI. No thank you. First, elder people might help their child. And their child's have to go to the university. So the elder people's work are empty. So the elder-- POI. Sorry. So elder people are also seriously need it. So their argument is [inaudible].

And for our second point, for the future, they said that we should give money for children. Because they will be the leader for the society in the future. But it sounds like that they're ignoring the right of the elder people, we believe so. We are [meant to be sick?] so equal. So elder people and the child are equal. Because they have fundamental human right. So we should not ignore the-- POI. --sorry-- ignore the human right, fundamental human right of the elderly people. Now, let me explain our second point for the elder people. POI. Sorry-- for the elder people. If we raise the pension age to the 70 years old, there are five gaps. But as I mentioned, 65 years old parents work [inaudible] grew up the children. POI. No thank you. They spend much, much money to grow-- to make their children to be, to grow. So such elder people, we should [inaudible] that poor person. We believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

Hello, everyone.We believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. First, let me summarize today's debate. The most important point is whether we can make Japan society better or not. On this point, their argument is for the person really need it and for the future, like elderly people. However, and their argument is elderly people can also work, as well as younger generation. POI. No thank you. However, it is true that now it's a aging society. And the challenge to work is for elderly people is increased. However, the ability is not same as younger generation. For example, less judgment, less strength. So they are workers younger generation's burden will be increased. So it is not good for our society. And depending on elderly people society is can't develop Japan. It is because it is important to give chances to the children. Because children have possibility to make better society. For example, they can learn quickly and they can observe their [inaudible]. POI. No thank you. So it is important to take measures for childrens, not elderly people. So [inaudible] our argument is individual [inaudible] will be decreased. So individual life leads happy life. And happy life is made old people can [inaudible] enough. So it is important to-- POI. No thank you-- so that therefore we believe that-- we don't believe this motion. Thank you.

Hello, everyone.So we believe that-- wait, where was it? Sorry. We believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. First, let me rebut opposition's second point. They said for the elder people. And they said there are no money in their wallets when they're 65 years old, when it's time to finish their work. But therefore, it is not true because there is a fact that they have some money left for their own future until-- POI. --they die. Sorry, no thank you. And then it is true that they used up the money to raise the children-- oh, wait, no. Not raise the-- use up, but they use the money to raise up children. But they also think about their future. If their wallet is not-- if their wallet is empty, that is their fault, not just-- and not their fault, excuse me.

And then I will summarize today's debate. The most important point is, is it a good thing if you raise up the age, or not? And on this point their idea was raising up the money and you can't get it-- oh, sorry. Because [inaudible] and they said the elderly is also needed, their money is also needed. But, however, our argument is superior. It is because if you want it, you can get the money earlier, if you want. If you are very need it. And our point is that there is a person who is really need it like 90 years old, because they don't have much money because they used up their savings. So we want to give the money who really needs it, and not the ones who can live the life still.  Like they're 55 years old, there are persons who can still live, and who can still enjoy their hobbies. But not much people if they don't have money. And also you can-- and the first and second speaker gave an explanation about the young people. You want to give to the young people. But there is also a way that to giving to the very old people who's in really need it. And additionally, it's going to be a good thing to raise up the good society. And like both of you says-- POI. --both of you said we can live a happy life. Thank you.