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Okay. Let me start with speech. Firstly, in my speech, I talk about two things. First is definition of this motion, and secondly, our main arguments. First is definition. Our definition is pension system is one of the social security systems. And also, people from the age of-- from 20 to 60 people has an obligation. They have the burden to pay the money for using pensions. And so moving on to our main arguments. We have two points in this debate. First is sustainable pension system, and second is adaption to aging society.

I'll explain the first point of our main argument. And first point is sustainable pension system. In the [status quo?], aging society is developing. And also, population of elderly people is going up, and more and more people going-- and the average of the age is going up because of the developing medical science and medical service. And in this point, let me think about what is the pension system and how important pension system is. The pension system is very important because the elderly people who can't work anymore get their age and they have trouble of the age of-- we can save such people by using the pension system. And pension system has to be continued forever because of this importance. And however, in the present situation we have two problems. As I said, Japan is facing the aging society so serious because the producing population is going down. And also, the elderly people who can work is going up. And the two problems is that [always here?], and first is youngsters have too much burden to pay money for using pension. And secondly, some elderly people who should be protected is not-- should be protected is not protected in the present situation, or in the future, they will be not protected by the pension system will be broken. And in the present situation, because of the development in medical service, the average of the age is going up. And many who under the 70 age for example, many people get pension even though they don't need such money or they can still work in the present situation. So we think that it's not necessary for them to pay pension some people. But after plan, we can maintain the pension system, which is very important for elderly people as I said. And because of the [inaudible] necessary to get such money can still work, and they can still work, and we can save pension to pay people who really need to live. We can save such people. And we should save in long term by maintaining the pension system. And we can save a lot of people in the future. So we are very to propose this motion. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that Japanese government shouldn't raise the pension age of the 70 years old. Let me rebut what the government team said. They said average of years growing [inaudible], but this can't cause increasing of number of workers. Such people can't work and actually, because old people can't work in Japan. But what is usual use [inaudible]? This shows old people-- Point of information? Sorry I can't answer. If I have time, you can ask me. This shows old people can't move enough to work. Therefore they can't work and their opinion is lost.

Next, let me explain our point. We have two points. The first point is there are many people who worry about life. The second point is too difficult to complete system of the motion. I will explain the first point. First of all, what is purpose of pension system? At the first glance, there are many reasons. However, the main purpose is [inaudible] of all age. On this point, our point is two. Let me explain first point. Let's imagine, how do you earn money in situation we can't working? Needless to say, you can't work because you're always pain, your eyes can't stay clear. So old age people can't work and [inaudible]-- sorry. In this situation the people can't work between 65 and 70 years old. It is the same between who can receive money now and who do so in this situation. And there are many people can't work. Next, let's think about wives. What if wife live longer than their [inaudible]. Sorry, [inaudible]. Nowadays, the movement of [inaudible] between male and females is [tremendous?]. However, all of company can't do so. In addition, they are old so they can't earn money by themselves. No need to say, many researchers say such people position between 65 years old and 70 years old. Therefore, Japanese government shouldn't raise the pension age of 70 years. If you have a question, let me-- sorry. You can ask me now. Could you please clarify your [signposts?] of your first argument? Sorry I can't hear. Could you please clarify your first argument? [Last word?]. What's the meaning of your first argument? A clear just one sentence. My rebutting? No, your first argument. Could you please explain your first argument clearly? [inaudible]. Argument. Argument, okay. Argument [inaudible]? Right. [Name?]. The first point is there are many people who worry about their life. Okay? Okay. That's all. Thank you.

Okay, let me start my speech. First, I will do three things in this speech. First of all, reconstruction, refutation, and our second point. So first of all, reconstruction, then rebuttal. So our first argument, they selfishly think that all elderly people have no ability to work. They selfishly think. So we don't-- as the first speaker, I wanted to explain, there is thanks to the medical technology, these kind of people will more, you know, get, you know, get ability to work, right? In the first situation. And moreover, we didn't say that it's a duty to work. We didn't-- POI. I'm sorry. We didn't say that it's a duty to work so their rebuttal is no meaning to our argument.

Then next, I would like to refute to their argument [inaudible]. And it's the same thing as my reconstruction. They selfishly think that the old people have no knowledge to work. They selfishly think. And this means like, you know, thanks to the [inaudible] medical care, or medical technology they can live, right? And after-- yeah, there is, you know, more [inaudible] people in the present situation that have the babies, who will be living. POI. --100 years, right? Half the people. This means like thanks to the medical care, these kind of people have the ability to work. So this means their arguments are very not important to this argument-- to this motion.

And next, moving on to our second point, our second point is about the solution to aging society. As just said, in the state of poor, the aging society [inaudible] thanks to the medical care, lots of people will increasing their life to the 100 years, or more than 100 years. This means producing population will decrease, right? For example, producing population, this means [20 to?] I don't know, yeah. So at 60, for example. So for the government, the producing population is very important because they will make the tax. They will make the money. They will make the industry of the country. It's very important, right? But in the future, or in the [inaudible] these kind of people will decrease because they have the pension. They have social care-- POI. They have these kind of things. So the [income?] tax, or industry, or something money, will used by the social security in the future for these kind of including pension system, or public works. So, for example, building a [bill?], or yeah. So after doing this plan, these kind of people will increase, producing population will increase in the future [inaudible]. So it's very important to taking this motion and increasing the producing population. It's very important because as I said, they are making the tax. They are making the money. They are making the industry. It's very important for the country, right? And in the [inaudible] situation, it's very natural things. For example, [inaudible] to the medical care and, for example, that government was hopeful that retiring age will be 70 years old. This means the government we are taking this motion it's very natural thing. So it's very important to take this motion. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that Japanese government shouldn't raise the pension age to the 70 years old. First, let me rebut government's first point. They said elderly population is increased. However, surely there are many people who can't work because disaster of the agings. Do you think we should ignore these people? The people who want to use pension if [existing?]-- Point of information. [inaudible].

For government's second point, they said about adoption to again society. However, I'm sure that Japan [inaudible] decreasing of population. However, just raising the age to receive pension to 70 years old [inaudible] systems. I don't think so. [inaudible] the age of your spouse [inaudible] the age of people are increased and we cannot live longer and longer. Then how the government raise the age. However, they raised the age, it can't solve this problem. Point. In order to maintain the pension, we concede the importance of the pension system, right? Don't you think that [inaudible] the pension system is more important than saving such people for 60 and to 70 right now in the future? But we can-- the government has so much time to make this system completely. And the government have the more important issues than making this [inaudible].

Next, let me rebut the opposition's first argument. They said you can live longer because of medical education. However, they said taking this motion [inaudible] solve the problem. It only [inaudible] people to [inaudible]. The people who are going about living and want to give pension are existing.

Let me explain our second point. [inaudible] to complete system of the motion. Please imagine from now we have to change system to raising pension age. What is needed for change? I think there are three things. First, the government advertised the motion to change the system. Every nation have to know the system has changed, so government [could post it?] on speaking on TV. Again, what has happened? People must be confused. Why we can't get the pension until 70 that why it must happen. And next second point, second, they have a lot of conference when to start. Now we have a lot of programs. For example, Olympics, [inaudible], and disasters. We don't have time to consider about pensions. We must think about other things. And the money is-- and how much money to provide it's also a big problem. Therefore, we strongly agree that we don't do this motion. Thank you.

Thank you, chairperson. We disagree this motion. Let me summarize today's debate. Most important point is the purpose of the pension. [inaudible] the purpose of pension is [inaudible] when we become the old. Please think about your youth after 50 years. [inaudible] situation after 50 years. If we have no money to live. If we can't move enough to work. If we can't receive any support, what can we do? Point of information. No thank you-- to live in society today, we have a lot of problems. We have this [fear?] of our old age to solve this problem. The pension is the best solution to [inaudible] when we work. The fact we can receive money-- Point of information. I'm sorry. We can receive money when we can't work, is very helpful. On their side, they said about big money of government. However, is this very important? Please remember what is the purpose of the pension. It is the sense security of the people in Japan. Now Japan is aging society as they said. Many people have fear about our old age. They define we have to work until 60. However, can we really work until 60? Tell me this without [inaudible] including this injury and disease. Point of information. All of us-- sorry. All of us can say yes, with confidence. They think the pension [inaudible] government was to provide me assistance with some [inaudible] including [inaudible] pension [inaudible] because there is a [inaudible] system. [inaudible]. Therefore, we strongly believe that the [inaudible] the pension is under 70. Thank you for [inaudible].

First, refutation to their second argument. So the last part of your memo. Refutation to their second argument. They talked about like this law becoming unfunctional. However, we believe that that is totally irrelevant. That is because, that is not unique just to this motion, right? That is also common with different kinds of bills, different kinds of laws. And this kind of-- they didn't clearly explain the process of how this actually going to damage the society. And we believe that that is not unique to just this motion, right? That kind of situation is not going to happen even in other kind of bills. Like for example, different kinds of laws such as, I don't know, like the phones or system. If this kind of system were to change there are going to be informed [inaudible] citizens, right? And okay, first of all, their second argument wasn't [fair?], and moreover, even if we were to write a refute to that, that is our argument.

Now, moving on to summarization. First, let me explain what is the most important part about this debate. The most important part in this debate is about whether the elderly people, between 60 to 70, is a functional workforce. It's an accurate workforce. Yes, we believe the government side believes that, yes, it is. Because as we have been repetitively saying, these kinds of medical services, these kinds of medicines, they have enabled us, enabled the people between 60 to 70 years old to be more functional than before. More functional than when this law was permitted. That is why we are proud to propose. And that is why we believe, yes, so that is why our second argument [inaudible]. However, on the other hand, let me explain why the opposition side doesn't stand. They fail to prove the burden. They fail to prove that why are the people between 60 years old to 70 years old is unfunctional. They didn't explain that at all, right? They just said that [inaudible] like disabled people can't work, so that's becoming a real [inaudible] for them. However,  these kinds of people with disabled people, they have different kind of social security systems, right? For these kind of insurance first of all on disabled people. So we believe that that is totally irrelevant. And their first argument, therefore, they said things like about worrying about life. But that is totally irrelevant. So therefore, the first and their second point is totally destroyed. Moving on to why the government side wins. Our side, as I've been saying, we fervently prove that why the people between 60 to 70 years old is functional. That is why we have said that these kind of limit of-- raising these kind of pension age to 70 years old is going to make a sustainable society that can save the vulnerable people, right? And that is the purpose of social security. That is the purpose of the pension system. So we believe that taking this motion is totally necessary in order to help these kinds of vulnerable people. That is why we are [inaudible].