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Hello everyone. Today, we support this motion. First, we define the motion as follows, government pay money as pension for more than 70 years old person, same as now. We have two points. The first point is to make good society, and second point is quality of life.

I will explain our stance. Our stance is this motion is there for people's quality of life. And I will explain the first point, to make good society. Now, I will explain a status quo in Japan. Average lifespan is raising in Japan, and so young people have big burden because of aging society. We think that this motions age is appropriate age. And if lacking of the labor become serious problem in Japan. For example, caregivers and teacher and nurse. So we have to increase such people, workers. So to improve the situations, we have to pay this motion to increase the worker. Japan have seniority system, so the elderly people may be the leader of nurse and caregivers and teacher. Nurse and teacher who is elderly have more knowledge than young people. So we need such people. [inaudible] elderly teachers have less [inaudible] than young teachers so the young teacher is better than elderly teachers. Don't you think so? However, medical is developing so people can work is increasing, and there are lot of people who can stay healthy and have more power. So that is [inaudible]. And people want work is increasing so if we take this motion, system will be good, because people think about this topic more. So to make good society, we need a lot of power and labor. So we have to-- sorry. We have to take this motion. Thank you.

Now, many elderly people are suffering from-- sorry. From fundamental problem and financial problem. So to protect these, we strongly oppose this motion. First, I'll rebut their first point. They said that [inaudible] misunderstanding their presentation. That now, over 65 elderly can get pension and even if they can get pension, they are difficulty to make a living because of the financial burden. So to make the more better society, we should not raise pension [inaudible] to age of 70 years old. So their argument does not standing.

Next, I'll explain our first point. Our first point is why is pension? And second point is to guarantee a minimum [inaudible]. I'll explain our first point. Our first point is why is pension? Now, I have two question. First, why government give pension to elders? It is clear that elderly cannot work and have no enough power to get enough income by any [inaudible]. So even if the elderly people can get job, the [inaudible] over 60 years people can get enough money to make a living by themselves. They have less power and they forced to work hard same as the younger people to make a living? It is clear that the elderly cannot make a living by a few incomes by themselves. But now in the present situation, the very serious situation so that if their taking this plan, the more elderly people are suffering from the financial burden, because they cannot get after retire-- they will retire until 70 years old. So few years ago, Japan raise the pension age to 65 from 60. As a result, a lot of elderlies are difficulty make a living. In the worst case, some elderly committing crime to enter prison because in the prisons they can live better than the incomes by themselves. So it is a serious situation. So to protect elderly peoples, Japan's government should guarantee the [inaudible] we strongly oppose this motion. Thank you.

Hello everyone. We strongly support this motion for us. Let me reconstruct and let me rebut the opposition first point. They said that elderly can't make a living because they have financial problem, but however if we take this motion, the retirement-- sorry, the re-employment system will increase so they can work easily. And now, AI or robot will increase, so the company use them and so working easily. And also, elderly people have a lot of knowledge so as a teacher, they can teach more good for students. And [inaudible] retirement employment system is very-- there is little retirement employment system so it's nonsense and-- I'm sorry. And also, they can get enough retirement allowance to live five years, only five years. Therefore, your [inaudible].

And let me explain our second point. Our second point is quality of life. We have two aspect, for elderly and for younger. Now in Japan, younger have to pay much money for pension. If we take this motion, we can reduce money have to they pay. I explain more. The pension age will up and elderly may work more, so younger don't have to pay much money for elderly. Now, re-employment system is [inaudible] and they can work easily. Also, there is AI or robot and elderly-- I'm sorry. AI have [inaudible] and working is not only power, knowledge and skill and something. So if we take this motion-- I'm sorry. Elderly become to think about their working and they have to continue work. And it's good for elderly and it's good for Japanese society. It makes elderly more active and they can feel a reason of living. It's good. I'm sorry. [crosstalk]. Now, average of life is increase, so the elderly can live more years and they can affect the good something for society. Therefore, we should-- Take this motion. We should take this motion. Thank you.

Now, elderly people are facing so many problems that is health problem, so their argument is so unrealistic. So this is why we strongly oppose this motion. So first, let me rebut to their first point. They said about the younger people are paying so much money so to reduce such people's burden we have to take this plan. However, we can take another policy to reduce young people's taxes or young people's burden. So they can't explain about the uniqueness of taking this motion because raising the pension age to 70 years old is directly connected to reduce young people's burden. So we can take another policy to reduce young people's burden. So therein is my stand. POI. No, thank you. And they said about the AI, [inaudible] AI makes the old people work easier. However the spreading of AI makes the elderly people more difficult to work because-- POI? No, thank you. AI is more efficiency than even if younger person so of course AI is more efficiency than elderly people. So such people's working place will be [inaudible] by AI because even in present situation, young peoples, their workplace is taken away by the AI. So they mentioned about AI's problem, so elderly peoples workplace is also taken away. So their argument is nonsense.

So let me reconstruct our argument. They said to our argument, employment will go up and elderly have a good knowledge. However, the elderly people have so many health problem so that they become the cancer, because people more older, people are more high risk of becoming cancer. So the more elderly people are having health problem. So working, they said about the employment will be raise. However, it is only recent because many elderly people are facing so many health problem such as difficulty to nursing or difficulty to moving their arms or legs freely without [inaudible]. POI. No, thank you. So elderly people cannot make a living.

So moving on to our second point. Our second point is to guarantee [inaudible] lives. Government role is to guarantee citizens' lives, which is people can eat to get enough nutrition or can live without any inconvenience. By giving pension, people who are more than 65 years old can send enough lives. So first of all, their side is misunderstanding today's Japanese pension system because in present situation, people who can get pension is over 65 years old, not 70 years old. POI. Yes, please? However, because of developing technology, people can stay healthy more than 70 years old. So what do you think about--? However, the more people become elderly, the more has possibility to facing the [inaudible]. And it is connected to our second point. And after making this plan, the 70 years old people who will not get pension will feel suffer because the already have plan to make living for 65 years old. [inaudible] our stand. So that's why we strongly oppose this motion. Thank you.

What is equality? It is government role and [inaudible]. So this plan mean that-- this plan loves equality for all citizens. So this plan can make society better. So that why we strongly oppose this motion. So next, I will talk about today's important point. Today's important point is that-- we have two points. The first, which can make better society for all citizen? And second, what is the quality of life? But first, remember that the government role is giving equality. They said about improving labor [inaudible] government should take this plan. However, how it make society better? Of course not. Because of their argument mean that the government love equality to move from the elderly because after plan, elderly can't get enough money after they live long with their jobs. Even now, the elder live and no enough money after they no jobs. And after plan, they have to live more less money for 10 years after they leave jobs. It is harsh for them because the government can't get equality for all citizens. So after plan make society more worse for all citizen so our [inaudible] and even government wants to improve labor, government shouldn't take older plan life with education and new nurse or something like that. So we should not take this plan. And second, I will talk about what is quality of life? They said that [inaudible] AI, the elderly can work easily. Even if they can work-- but they can't work older because they are too weak and they have to work all day to earn the income that the [inaudible] because they are older. And [inaudible]. Even if the AI help them but they can't work all day to earn the income or something like that. So after plan, the quality of life is more worse. And moreover, our speaker told you that after plan makes more equality of life so their argument is not standing and our argument good. Thank you.

Hello everyone. Today's topic is Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. One thing about our opposition second point, we have to guarantee [inaudible] lives. However now, the employment system is improving. For example, we can develop AI in supporting our work and we can help the elderly peoples are working. And they can work if they suffer from disease. For example, using internet [inaudible] and so on. So they can even they don't moving.

And let me summarize today's debate. The most important part is quality of people's life. In status quo, the Japan has been surely aging. But company work is-- no, thank you. Healthy lifespan is increasing and so why don't we adapt to this fact? And now, there is a fact that elderly people work [inaudible] and the [inaudible] is that working isn't always a burden but also [inaudible]. On the basis of these things we have [inaudible] improving quality of people's life is increasing the labor force and we are-- okay. So after taking this plan, over 65 years old people cannot get enough pension, so it means that such people still [inaudible]. But now as I stated, lot of elderly people can work healthily and now, there is a rule that company have to employ until 65. And we only need to expand five years to get this motion. And second merit is quality of life. As I said, working isn't only demanded but [inaudible] of living. And by working, elderly people can have a lot of reason. For example, they can have motivation of pursuit and they can have-- therefore, we're strongly against this motion. Thank you.