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Hello, everyone. Today's topic is Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. We define that the retirement age also makes as same as the cost of pension. We have two points. The first point is aging society, aging society. The second point is increasing the number of workers. The second point is increasing the number of workers.

I will explain the first point, aging society. Now, Japan is aging society and the [institution?] will be worse and worse. That means the number of elderly is increasing and the number of children are decreasing. And people have only way to get money by working, but they're getting older. Their ability for the work so then they have to retire their work. Then they lost their income. So they lost [the whole?] pension. But if the number of children is decreasing, the amount of pension is less than before. So elderly people can't get enough money. So they have to just work as far as they can-- as far as they [can't?]. Therefore, Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

Raising the pension to the age of 70 creates risk of the working elderly and undermines the essence of pension. So, therefore, we are proud to oppose this [motion?]. So we have two points. First, risk of the working elderly will increase. And second, damage to elderly who need pension. So let me first [rebuttal?] to their first point before I move onto my point. So first of all, they said we can get more elderly people to work in the [study?]. However, because increasing situation, there is no mandatory retirement and therefore elderly can actually work until the age that they are confident of working, or they can work until they have the ability to work. So, therefore, increase status quo the freedom of working is actually a [thing?] for the eldering. And because the elderly--

So let me explain our first point. So our first point is risk of the working elderly will [help it?]. So first of all, what is purpose of the pension? It is to support elderly who cannot work or support themselves because they cannot work or they cannot earn any money from working their job. And because, in other words, the elderly recieve pension because they cannot support themselves. And because [increase?] Japan's society, people over 65 are considered to be elderly and that's because on average that age is where most people have difficulty working or they have difficulty supporting their lives. And actually, because the ability to work is decreasing in that average life and also because increasing the age of receiving pension creates a very dangerous situation. For example, elderly, even though they cannot work in a safe situation or in a situation they have the elderly to work, it will actually create those-- it will actually force those elderly to work even extra five years than current status quo. And because they cannot work and because they cannot [be?] after increased situation it is 65 and after that point, it will be 70. So, therefore, they should work more extra five years because they cannot receive pension to support their lives. And because elderly, there are many circumstances for individual elders. So, therefore, we should prioritize this circumstances and we should make the average [life?] 65 to give more choices for the elderly and not give the extra five months of the burden to the elderly. So, therefore, we are proud to oppose this motion because we will only increase the risk of dangerous situation, for elderly and we will actually decrease the choices for the elderly and it will only make a good situation. It will only reverse the good situation in the status quo. So therefore, we are proud to oppose this motion. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. Hello. We believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Let me [rebut our?] opposition's first point. They said raising the pension age would only increase the risk the elderlies who are at work. However, if they have trouble working or if they don't have the ability to work safely, it depends on the company whether to hire them or not to hire them. And currently, the retirement age or the average retirement age is 65 and there are some people who cannot work at 65. So raising the pension age would-- they said it will increase the risk of elderlies who [aren't?] working, but the current situation is very similar. So, therefore, we believe that this is not a very big problem.

Next, let me reconstruct the government's first point. They said that if we raise the pension age to 70 years old, the people who are 65 and now retiring do not get enough pension, because they're retired they don't have any job, but the pension age is raised to 70. However, we define the motion as pension is paid when they retire, so we're raising the retirement age as well or at the same time.

Then let me explain our second point, increasing the number of workers. We believe that by raising the pension age to 70, the retirement age will also be raised to 70 because the money is paid when they retire. By doing so, the number of people who can work, especially those who have been working in that particular field for many years, or professionals, will increase. As we said before, as we said in our first point, Japan is now in the aging society meaning-- yes? Right now, there's no mandatory retirement age. Don't you think that people who can work may work? Yes, but most companies define that the employees should retire. They set their retirement age, so we don't have that definite retirement age in general. But the average retirement age is 65. Our aging society, meaning the younger people, are decreasing. Like right now, one young person supporting elderlies with their pension is one. One young person is supporting one elderlies. This is too much burden on the younger generation. [inaudible]. No thank you. And we think that raising the pension age is necessary evil. Therefore, Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. Raising the pension to 70 creates risk of the working elderly and undermines the essence of pension. So first of all, let me rebuttal to both their first and second point. In their first point, they said that elderly can work and there's many [good?] situations. However, first of all, they said that they can as far as they can. However, as we know, there is no mandatory retirement age. They said the companies usually they make them retire after that. However, why is raising the pension the only way? Can't the government promote companies to employ elderly as well from now on because there's not enough people? Why is pension the only way? They lack the uniqueness in this point, therefore, you can say it is not very important. As a matter of fact, we believe that we are increasing the risk by making them-- because basically, we're forcing them to work because they cannot get any income if they do not work. In this situation, we believe that many elderlies has many circumstances, many-- yes? If they don't have the ability to work, they-- the pension is not the only way to get money. Some people are disabled. They have-- Yeah, somebody are disabled but what if they're not disabled? But they do have many problems. We cannot say that there is people who cannot get additional support except from pension. And pension, even if they can, we believe that pension is an additional thing. If we lose that, at least somewhat, their life would become more hard and they have to work and [fill?] that up. And we believe that alternatives are not always working in this situation.

And next, let me [refer?] to the second point. They said that we can increase the number of workers. However, again, why is this so unique to pension? We can promote this. We can, for example, get additional workers from other places. Why is this so unique to increasing the pension age to 70? Second of all, it actually damages the elderly people. We're trying to protect these elderly people. However, there's many situations, as we said, will damage these people. We believe that, at the end, we must protect these people and we believe that we are making a worse situation by actually forcing them to work. And, therefore, we believe that's a bad situation.

Next, let me reconstruct their first point. They said that, right now and after, that does not change [barely?]. However, as we know, 65 is defined as elderly. Basically, we're making elderly people work. They might think that five years doesn't change that much but I think it does change it much because five years is a big thing. When you become more old, we believe that 65 and 70, there's a big difference between the abilities we have. And even if it does not change a big amount, we believe that, at least, we're making it worse. Therefore, the fact they're making it worse is a bad thing. Therefore, we believe that this is very important and we should save these elderly people, to save the elderly people and the people who are receiving services because if the service is bad, the people who receive services will also get [damaged?].

Next, let me explain our second point. Our second point is damage. So let's let at the status quo which is 65 years old. Right now, everyone can get a pension from 65 years because they are qualified as elderly people. However, if you raise it to 70 years old, basically, the government is saying it is okay to make a worse situation for the government because they cannot get additional income after 65. The government is saying that it's okay to do that. Next, what will happen? It comes to 70, 75, 80. The government is forgiving a situation to make a bad situation when there are alternatives, for example, increasing the consumption tax which is happening right now. Therefore, we believe that we should not allow this situation because it will get worse and worse. This is important because we're losing the essence of pension. And people cannot get any pension in the future. Therefore, we are proud to oppose this motion.

Okay. Hello, everyone. My name is [Iza?]. Pensions [compared?] to elderly population. So we should provide pension for elderly people to need. [I summarize today's debate?]. Status quo, a lot of people need to pension, right? And now we decide to provide pension to 65 years old, right? And even if the cases will happen [our point?] however significant impact, yes, they said aging society and the worker will increase. Yes, the situation will happen. However, this situation will actually make benefit for all people, I don't think so. And aging is different to ourselves, right? And this means there are people whether they can work or not. However, after take this motion, elderly people who different to work will work because leaving [inaudible] to live without money who are 70 years old elderly. This mean risk will increase. And the risk will affect not only them, but also society. And if we want to pay tax to provide a pension, we have alternative, for example, immigrant worker or increase conception. But [inaudible]. So why elderly forced to work that they cannot do enough to work because they're aging. And our second speaker clearly showed we cannot stop to change pension rules because this aging society will more increase in the new future, right? And so, this probably have a serious risk to support elderly and the degrees [inaudible] for people. So this have a serious risk to support elderly and more increase [better?] for the people. And so we should take this motion. First of all, risk will increase to elderly. And these old people's burden will increase too. And so we should not take this motion to more coverage for elderly people and more decrease old people's [inaudible]. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. First, they said we lose access on the second point. However, the most important point is what is the thing or process that we want to protect? On this point, their idea is to protect elderly people is most important thing. But we think, to protect our country for Japan, and young people is the most important thing because today's Japan, the big problem and the harsh reality is the number of children are decreasing. No thank you.

I mean, Japan is aging society. If the government continue paying the person to 65 years old, our country become nearly bankrupt because we have to spend our tax for government bond and national [defense?] and the relationship between other countries. So there are no uphold to continue paying money [impact?]. But raising the pension age to 70 years old, the number of worker increase so we can improve our economy and we can decrease young peoples [harder?]. So, therefore, we believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.