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The pension can work-- sorry. The person can work five years, the blank of the years. So our definitions. Next before our points, I will explain our team line. Our team line is we are respect both quality of life young people and elderly people also. So please keep in your mind. Next, let's move on to our point. Point of information. No, thank you. Today, we have two point. The first point is burden will decrease, and second point is advantage for elderly people.

Now, I'll explain our first point, burden will decrease. So at the status quo, elderly people can get pension from 65 years old. That's why they are many burden for many people. Today, I have two aspect. First aspect is for young people, and second aspect is for government burden.I'll explain one by one. First, for young people burden. Now as you know, Japan is the aging society. And contrary to that, the [inaudible] is also promoting. However, the situation that young people pay the money for pension doesn't change. Point of information. No, thank you. It means the time to get pension or the amount of money [inaudible] now. That's why a young person has to pay a lot of money for pension. However, it's very big burden, right? For young people. Point of Information. No, thank you. But that's because now, there are many healthy people even they are over 65 years old, but they can get pension. Is it really necessary?`We don't think so. Point of information. No, thank you. It's a kind of waste [inaudible] so it is burden for young people. And second aspect is for government. Now, government hold a lot of debt as you know, and there is not enough money. By some reason, it include problem of pension. So give pension from early age is burden for also government. So we can see there are a lot of burden to pay from 65 years old. Point of information. No, thank you. However, after taking this plan, such burden of young people and government will decrease. That's because generally, the age to get pension will be late and only elderly people who really need pension can get pension. So taking this motion a really effective way to Japan-- no, thank you. So being late for the age has very advantage we believe. Therefore, we strongly support this motion. Thank you.

Taking this plan never decreases the burden for such government or the young people and it will only increase the burden and the harsh society for the elderly. So that is why to protect elderly, we strongly oppose this motion. So in my speech, I will first rebut what the previous speaker has said and I will explain our first argument, protect elderly, and our second speaker will explain about legitimacy. Okay. Moving on to the rebuttal. In their first definitions, they said that we will take this plan only to the elderly who can work until 70 but in the first place, this motion is not unique at all. Why is that is because the elderly who can work till 70 is so minority and they never explained-- POI?No, thank you. So there's no need for it in the first place. And for their first argument about burden will decrease, but in the first place, where does this pension come from? It's simple. It comes from the money the elderly earn when they where young, so therefore, the young people does not pay it. So elderly are saving up money for their future and they are getting that money back from the government. So why in the first place does the government or the young people get burden in the first place? It's so unclear. POI? Yes? [inaudible] idea? [inaudible] they have more detail example? Pardon? It sounds more idea [inaudible] so they have detail example? What we are saying is simple, that the pension comes from the money which these elderly earn before, so therefore, young people does not have to pay for them. So therefore, the burden of such people does not exist in the first place. So therefore, this argument does not stand in the first place.

So moving on to our first argument about protect elderly. Okay. In the present situation, what kind of people are elderly? When they get over 60 or stuff, their physical ability declines and they cannot work any longer. So that is why in the present situation, the retirement age is about 65, because that is-- POI? No, thank you. And also when they get old, company will not take them in the first place. It's because company want people who can work a lot. They only take the young people who has more physical ability and who can work more. So elderly will not be employed. So therefore in the present situation, it is already difficult for elderly to be employed in the first place. So therefore elderly doesn't have any way to earn money. So what is pension system? Pension system is where elderly who cannot gain any more money by themselves get money which they have saved up when they where young. And they are getting that money back so that they are able to live and buy foods and water and things they need in the-- things they need in their life. So therefore, pension system is the only way which the elderly can get money. So what will happen after plan and why we not protect elderly is simple. After plan, the age where the elderly can get money will become 70, so therefore, five years gap. So this five year, elderly cannot earn money and they have no way to buy food, water, or things they need to live. So therefore, elderly will die and we must not make this happen because elderly are the weakest people in the society and they are most vulnerable. No, thank you. So to protect them we strongly oppose. Thank you.

Hello everyone. [inaudible] today, we strongly support this motion. First in this speech, I like to cover refutation and reconstruction of our second point. For refutation, they say that company don't require elderly people as employee. However in fact, we can see many elderly people who are working in their time. For example, parking [inaudible], so their argument is weak.

And next, reconstruction. No, thank you. They said that elderly people can get money that they pay when they are young. However now, young people have to pay a lot of money to their future, so the burden is very big we can say. No, thank you. Their argument cannot stand. Our argument is superior.

Let me [inaudible] our second point, advantage for elderly people. I'll explain two aspects, first is good for elderly people's health, second is their income become [inaudible]. I'll explain one by one. Under the status quo, they get pension from 65 age so the opportunity of work decrease. However if we take this motion, they can get pension from 70 age so there is five years interval they get pensions. So that why they have to work for their-- they find job newly and-- no, thank you. And it produce positive interest of works. No, thank you. Elderly people try to go to outside. For example, someone who stay at home after getting pension. However if we take this motion, they have to work so they will go outside. And the other hand, employment increase because company have their eye to elderly people [inaudible] getting pension, that's why they need to become active employment rate. Therefore, it's good for elderly people, not only elderly people but also company. Generally speaking, pension is so lack of [inaudible] and we don't know when amount of money decrease. In fact, present situation, people who is not now worker-- Point of information? No, thank you. But also elderly people afraid about the situation, decrease pension. So if government connect present situation, it possible not to enough for their future. However if we take this motion, first, the age elderly people can get pension rise, so they have to work just because they need money to live. So they get income more [inaudible] than before. So that's why it benefit for them. Therefore we strongly support this motion. Thank you.

Healthy doesn't really mean that the elderly don't have to get pension, right? In the first place. Therefore, they have to-- therefore, even if some elderly are healthy, but in the first place, there is necessary for them to get the pension in the first place. Therefore we strongly oppose this motion. First of all, rebuttal for their argument, second of all. I'll reconstruct our second argument. First of all, rebuttal. They said about our argument, some people are you working with [registration?], but what can be the reason why some elderly who are working don't have [inaudible] to -get the pension in the first place, right? Therefore, they have the [inaudible] that working means not necessary of getting the pension in the first place. Therefore, they never prove it.

Moving on to rebuttal for their second argument. They said about elderly people disadvantage and some elderly have to go out and have to be employed. But how can you say-- how can they said that some people who have to go out don't have to get the pension? For some elderly who have disable people will be forced to work because of this motion, by this motion. Therefore, this can never be reason to propose this motion.

Moving on to our second argument about legitimacy. They have legitimacy to use the pension in the first place. First of all, why does elderly pay pension for government? Because after retirement actually, for some elderly, they want to [inaudible], they want to get money because of the pension, and they can [inaudible]. And therefore, this relationship is not give-and-take relationship in the first place. And this same as the tax system, something like that. Actually, the older still have to pay tax and that tax will be used for infrastructure and something like that. It is not the system about the give and take since they have to pay it to government and the government have to support some [inaudible] infrastructure [inaudible]. And this is the same as the pension system, since they have to pay the pension for government and when they are retire, government have to pay pension for the elderly. It is simply situation about give and take situation because elderly can request a pension whenever he wants to get it, because actually, he have legitimacy because he have already paid it. Therefore, [inaudible] that the elderly can get pension. And why this legitimacy is so important? Because it is around the contract between the government and their citizen. Therefore, government should be trustable for citizen. And if the elderly require some pension system, actually, government have to support for the elderly in all the cases as a pension system. Therefore, we beg to oppose this motion. Thank you.

It's true that older [inaudible] is decreasing rapidly and majority of elderly can't work and in the worst case after taking this motion, this elderly will be forced to work and in the worst case, they cause accident or something [inaudible]. So the elderly working itself is problematic and in order support of this elderly, we strongly oppose this motion. In my speech, I have two point. First point about elderly, this motion is good or bad? On second point, which we should prioritize, elderly or young people? First point, elderly. They said that this motion is good for elder's health because they starting to work but that is problem because their physical ability decreasing, right? And in some cases, this elderly have disability of physical and in the worst case, they are forced to work in order to continue to live and because of disability, they cause accident. That is why this motion will never good for elders' health. And moreover, because of that reason, company won't employ this elderly. So this motion is not good for elder's income. So if elderly have good health, that never means that this elderly can be employed by company. Okay. Moving on to second issue. Which we should prioritize, elderly or young person? As for young people, tax will little increase but that's all, right? The effect on young people is that all. So at this point, what we should do is to protect this elderly, because we elderly is weakest people and elderly paid for pension system. And at this point, if elderly don't have money, there are no water, no clothes, and no food for elderly and they should be starving after their retirement. So in order to protect this-- in order to protect this elderly, we strongly oppose this motion. We should never allow it. [inaudible] age of initial system. Thank you.

Hello everyone. Thank you [inaudible]. First, let me rebut what opposition said. They said that give-and-take relationship is important. However, after taking this motion, elderly people can get pension. So give-and-take relationship between government and citizen will not change. So it no problem.

Let me continue to summarize. The most important point is to protect the quality of life even in the young people. As our first speaker said, now Japan is suffering from the problem of aging society and declining birth rate. So this problem is related to today's motion [inaudible]. The [inaudible] situation after taking this motion, the burden of young people will increase and elderly can live more activity as our teammate said. And now, there are many healthy elderly people who can work. As you now, Japan is long life country, right? And in my own case my grandmother, her part-time job for cleaning up the company, and my grandfather still work in his work even now. So this means such healthy elderly people is not minority. And so as our second speaker said, working has good effect for elderly people. They don't have to stay their home. They don't have to [inaudible]. So they can go out and they can communicate with other employees. So Japan's government should pay the pension for people only who really need pension, such as who can't work. So we believe taking this motion brings much benefit than now or change the present situation. So therefore, Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. That's all. Thank you.