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A burden on Japanese economy-- burden on Japanese economy. Current situation, our aging society is advancing in Japan. So it is said that one adult has to support three elderly people. It is burden for adult people, right? And also, government have to prepare pension a lot for average people because elderly people is increasing in Japan. So government have to prepare pension a lot for elderly people, and it becomes burden on Japanese economy too. However, after take this plan, elderly people will work until 70 years old, so government don't have to prepare pension for elder people, not [early?]. So it does not become burden on Japanese economy. And it is good for not only Japanese government but also Japanese adult people because elderly people have to-- elderly people can work until 70 years old. So... [inaudible]. Yes? So by implementing your motion, are you saying that the retirement age would also be 70? Yes. So it will correct that situation in Japan, create [inaudible]. Now in Japan, aging society, it's advancing. So we can say that our aging society is advancing in the future in Japan. So it will be so bad because it is said that one adult has to support three elderly people. It is burden for us because adult have to supporting three elderly people, only one adult. So it is a burden for adult. For this reason, we strongly propose this motion. Thank you. [applause]

Good afternoon, everyone. Today, we are given the motion that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old, and we strongly oppose this motion. Firstly, I'd like to assert our two arguments. We have two arguments. Our first argument is that if we implement this motion, the burden on the elderly people would-- it can be a burden on elderly people, and our second point is that if we implement this motion, the economy in Japan will be-- this motion would lead to an economic stagnation. And next, I'll talk about the first contention. The reason why we assert like that is if we implement this motion, the elderly people would not be able to receive pension for another 10 years. That means-- [inaudible]. No, thank you. That means elderly people can neither-- [inaudible]. Yes. You said if we [take this ground?] elderly people can't receive pension. However, we do find that a retirement age is 70 years old. So elderly people don't worry about it. But elderly people cannot do high-level work. Elderly people only work as welfare work or volunteers. So we don't think it is good for elderly people.

So next, I'd like to rebut to what they said. They said that burden of Japanese economy is really serious now, but if we don't implement this motion, we can-- elderly people's job don't get much money, so it won't be really economic impact. So for all reasons, we oppose this motion. [applause]

Thank you, Chair. First, I will rebut what the government team said-- or what the [inaudible] team said. They said that elderly people can't do high-level work so they can't earn money. But at this stage, the health for elderly people is good because of the high-level treatment or kind of that. So they can work done past.

And I will explain our second point. Our second point is that [inaudible] situation. Firstly, what is a pension? Pension is for all citizens in Japan and it is essential to them in their old age. And present situation, there are some people who don't pay into the national pension in Japan. This situation brings Japan to [bad?] effect. As I said before, the pensions should be paid for every citizens and the pension is [piled?] up by X generation. So the present situation, someone don't pay into the national pension, is bad for the future. [inaudible]. No, thank you. Then why this situation happens? Because the young think that we might not take the pension in their future. So we have to remove this-- we have to remove their fear of their future. So if we take this plan, we can change this situation. If the 70 years old would be set as the pension age, the amount of money which Japanese government have to pay will decrease. So the risk which the young will not-- the risk which the young will not be given the pension will decrease. And it means that if we take this plan, the more and more people-- more and more young people will pay into the national pension. It will occur-- yes. [inaudible]. So just because the age would go up, how would the people pay more? Can you explain the process? Say it one more time, please? Can you explain why the people would have the incentive to pay a pension after the motion? Okay. So I will repeat after plan. If we take this plan, the amount of money which Japanese government have to pay will decrease. And so the risk which the young will not be given the pension will decrease. And it means that if we take this plan, more and more people will pay into the national pension. [inaudible] good situation in Japan. Therefore, I strongly propose this motion. Thank you. [applause]

So as the opposition side, we strongly against this motion. So firstly, let me reconstruct our first point. So the opposition side told us that-- we told that the poverty of elderly people is really serious. They told us that because of this technology, elderly people are healthy or something like that, but even if they are healthy, those elderly people are biased because they are elderly people. And most companies set the retirement age as 60 years old, which means that people think that elderly people cannot do the skilled work because they are elderly people. So because of this, elderly people sometimes will come in situations that although they are really healthy they cannot work. And because of these situations, the elderly people income is declining. So because of this situation, our first point, of which the poverty of elderly people, still stands.

So let me rebut to their first and second arguments. Their first argument is because of these elderly people, it is really hard burden on Japanese society. However, because there are alternative workers such as immigrants or working mothers these days and they are really competitive workers, what is the necessity of making these elderly people working after their retirements because they've been working like for 30 years? So they should enjoy their hobbies rather than working after their retirement age. So from these reasons, there's no-- for all these reasons, we think that the burden of government is not so strong because of all the new workers and also we should consider more about elderly people.

So let me rebut to their first and second arguments. Their first argument is because of these elderly people, it is really hard burden on Japanese society. However, because there are alternative workers such as immigrants or working mothers these days and they are really competitive workers, what is the necessity of making these elderly people working after their retirements because they've been working like for 30 years? So they should enjoy their hobbies rather than working after their retirement age. So from these reasons, there's no-- for all these reasons, we think that the burden of government is not so strong because of all the new workers and also we should consider more about elderly people.

So let me introduce our second point, which is that implementing this motion will stagnate economy. So our reasoning is that because people are told that they cannot receive pension until 70 years old, most people will keep money and refrain from spending money. So imagine you are in such a situation. You've been told that you can receive money from 60 years old, but after the motion, you cannot receive until 70 years old. So you save those money in order to manage your life. So what is the impact? It's that it will [connect you to?] depression, and this is really serious because in the status quo, the depression of Japan is really serious, but if we implement this motion, it will further deteriorate this situation. So this is really serious. For all these reasons, we think that we should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you. [applause]

So in today's debate, there are two major clash points, firstly, which side is actually beneficial for the Japanese economy and secondly, is changing the retirement age and pension age actually effective like our opponents tell us. So firstly, which side is beneficial for the Japanese economy. What our opponents told you in today's debate is that there would be an economic impact. Because the elderly would keep working for another 10 years, it would be beneficial for the Japanese economy. However, we've told you that first of all despite the fact that the elderly works a lot, because there is a social bias and prejudice towards elderly in the first place, the company wouldn't pay a lot of money to the elderly in the first place. And on top of that, because the elderly would have to wait for another 10 years until they receive their pension, in the end, they will only save their money throughout their working career and would therefore spend even less money than the status quo. It would ultimately lead to an economic stagnation like we told you in our second contention. So for all these reasons, we think that there would be no economic benefits by implementing this motion. And second of all, is changing the retirement age and the pension age actually effective. So what our opponents told you in today's debate is firstly that there would be an economic impact and secondly that more people would start paying the pension, that there would be a positive cycle. But regarding their first point, as I told you previously, because there is still a social prejudice and because there will be an economic stagnation, their first point would not stand. And secondly, about the unfair situation, we don't see the [inaudible] process of how people would actually have the incentive to pay pension just because the age would be raised to 70 years old. And we think that the process is unfair here. And moreover, we presented to you an alternative about implementing more immigrants, about allowing young mothers to work more. And we think that our alternative is more effective because there would be no burden on the elderly at all by our side. So we think that our alternative, because it has no burden on the elderly, would be a better choice for the Japanese society rather than the motion. So for all these reasons, we think that changing the retirement age and pension age is also ineffective. And so we can see from these two clash points that the harms that we presented to you would outweigh the benefits that they've told us. And for all these reasons, we are so proud to oppose. Thank you. [applause]

Thank you, my name is [inaudible]. I will talk their second point. They said that elderly people will be depressed because of lack of money. However, that possibility is very low because the old people have saved money during their working. So their second point is not serious. [Can I have information?]. No, thank you.

And I'll explain our first point. Yes. [inaudible] Yes. The status quo is really unfair for the young age because the young age is putting money to the government, however there is only a small possibility that young age can't get enough [inaudible]. What is the [inaudible]? [inaudible] is for all citizens and [inaudible] to live. Yes, usually human's body and brain is weaker with getting age, so we will not be able to work hard. And moreover, the company want young people because they can work harder. So the elderly age people will lose their money. So they, yes, can't get enough money to live. A [inaudible] is really essential and-- [inaudible]. No, thank you. And important for the old age. Yes, yes, yes, yes, today's clash point is which is good for old age people. Their second point is about [inaudible] elderly. However, they only see in the short term. My second speaker [inaudible] about that. So they may see the long term, our second point is really superior to their second point. And in the long term, this problem is really serious for the young age. Therefore, I strongly propose this motion. Thank you.