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Good afternoon everyone in this hall. Today, we are giving the motion that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. So today, government side have two argument. First argument, it raise burden on young people. Second argument, which is going to be explained by my partner, is more elderly people to work.

So let me explain our first argument. First argument is raise burden on young people. So now, Japan is aging society, which we are to organize. So the young people have to bear a heavy burden. But only one young person can provide [inaudible] for elderly people. So it is so heavy burden for young people. But if we introduce this plan, we can decrease the burden on young people. So it might be take care of elder people. It will need care also young people. So it is so big [inaudible]. No, thank you. So if we introduce plan, the burden of young people is small. So why is this plan important? Yeah. Can you explain how beneficial to young people that is [inaudible]? Okay. So to take care of future, so of course young people. So if we continue this situation, such as to take heavy burden on young people, so in the worst case people will [inaudible]. So it is bad for them and Japan. So to take our [inaudible]. For Japan, young people is so important because to take care of future is of course young people. So if we continue this-- so if we take so heavy burden on young people, it is so bad. So young people is not enough power to live for money or skill. So even in this case, too much heavy burden on young people, Japan will be [inaudible]. So it is bad for Japan. So for this reason, we want to propose. Thank you.

Government has to save citizen, especially the disadvantaged because they can't live without any help and it's more important than help majority that be able to live by only themselves. Because disadvantages can't live by only themselves. First attack, they said about the less burden but I don't think-- but I don't think it's important because they don't show the amount of taking motion's impact. I think this motion reduce pension only five years, so this impact is little. So also, [crosstalk]. So I think this is not only reason of heavy burden [inaudible]. Okay. There are other reason of heavy burden. For example, consumption tax and so on. So I think if we take this motion, that-- sorry. But young people don't really feel that our burden reduce, because this motions reduce only the low burden. Okay.

Next, I say our first argument. Our first argument, government have-- our first argument is that government have to help disadvantages that will not able to live by only themselves. Okay. Old people decline in their physical strength because of high age, so they retire work and get pension when they are 65 in Japan. But if we take this [inaudible] motion, they can't get pension when they are 70 age. Sorry. So it's difficult to live by themselves. And they are now [inaudible]. For example, public assistance but it's restriction is very strict. Also, help of family but other family members have their work so it's difficult to [inaudible] not only themselves but also help old people. Also they can [inaudible] but it's not enough because old people physical strength decline. Okay. So you saying that people who are between the ages of 65 and 70 they're weak. However, the life expectancy of Japan is about 80 years old so I think that these people are very healthy and the health expectancy-- Okay. I'll explain after my speech. Okay. Therefore, some old [inaudible] their physical strength decline so it's difficult to that old people work longer. So therefore some old people can't get money because they have to retire work-- they have to retire work but they can't get money. Okay. [inaudible]. Okay. Government must help these disadvantages because of they can't live without help. So I think government have to put help them before their own needs. Thank you.

Thank you sir. So first, I would like to make a rebuttal to what the previous speaker said. So the previous speaker said that there are other ways to help people between-- to this however, the first speaker could not clarify why we need to raise the pension age to 70 years old. However, the people who are between the ages of 65 and 70, these people were born during the baby boom and there are many, many people who were born between these five-year span. So if we raise the pension age to 70 years old, then there would clearly be less burden on young people because there are so many people between the ages of 65 and 70. So this is my first refutation.

And our second refutation is that they said-- no, thank you. They said that we need to help the disabled people of society. However, as I was saying in my POI, the current health expectancy for Japanese people is about 75 years old. That means the people between the ages of 65 and 70, these people are extremely healthy and as I am about to explain in my argument, these people can work. So because most people are not disabled and because they can work, we think that we strongly support this motion.

So now, I would like to move on to my argument, which is more elderly people who work. Point of information. Yes? You said that Japanese healthy life is 70, but why do you think this is the reason that all old people can work by 70? Can you explain that further? Okay. You said that Japanese health life is 70, okay, but why don't you think this is the reason-- why do you think this is a reason that old--? Okay, okay, okay. So you are saying that these people between the ages of 65 and 70, they are clearly disabled and they have no family members to support them and the government can't support them in any way other than the pension. However, there's social insurance. There's social assistance. There are clearly other alternative ways to help the people who are weak between the ages of 65 and 70. And as I was trying to explain, most people, because the health expectancy is 75 years old, most people between 65 and 70, because these people most of them are healthy, we [inaudible]. So as for my second point, more elderly people who work. So right now as I was saying, a lot of people between the ages of 65 and 70 are healthy and most of them can work, right? So if we keep the age of-- if we keep the pension age of 65 years old, then this is basically a label from society that shows that these people should be retired. However, there are many, many elderly people between the ages of 65 and 70 who yearn to work. For example, at our school district [inaudible], there are currently about 15 teachers who are working over the age of 65 part-time because they love to teach. So because of there are lot of people who yearn to work, I would like to end our second point. Thank you.

Our opposition is simple. Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. Now, let me explain [inaudible]. Our stance is that we have to save the elders who can't work their living because they can't work because of their physical problem. And let me attack their [inaudible]. Their [inaudible] most elder between 65 age and 70 age are healthy but in this point, they don't show us that why they are healthy. They imagine that because-- do you know that almost all jobs are-- that almost all job, the job needed by society are physical labor in our situation, in the present situation. Sorry. Let's imagine, do you think that elder can work in physical labor? It's not. Can you imagine an elder over 65 age is carrying [inaudible] but if they carrying that [inaudible] they will break their body. It's clear. Sorry. If they break their body, they can't make living. So that why we think that this point that the elder between 65 and 70 is healthy is not too recent.

And let me reconstruct our last point. They said that the elders between 65 and 70 years are very [inaudible], so they talking about this point in short time as that if they are over 70 ages, they can't become workforce. So that why we think that this point is not important.

And let me move on our second point. Our second point is that we have to save the elders who can't work. [inaudible] when they become 65 years, in current, the retirement age is 65 age. They can receive the pension and make their living without working. Let's imagine because there is a man who have work about 65 years old. When he become 65 years, they can retire the company and at the same time, he can receive pension and continue to make living. But after taking this motion, the elder-- POI. Sorry. Need to work for five years after retiring from their work when they are 65 years. All of the many jobs-- almost all jobs are physical labor such as constructing something and such. Let's imagine a case; there is an-- POI. Sorry. Who is 65 years and have work for his living. I said there is only jobs physical labor. Do you think that elder work in physical labor? It's not. Can you imagine the--? So if they try to-- so if they can [inaudible] because they working in constructing, it will clear that they break their body. And if they break their body, they can't work no more, so that they can't get money and can't make living and began to die, because we know that-- so thank you.

So even though a healthy life span in Japan is longer and longer, Japan's elderly people even can't work for the physical reason as a characteristic of [inaudible]. POI. Sorry. They also trying to get assistance too so it's very, very [inaudible] specific [inaudible]. So their work as for duty of the government. We should focus on those minorities. Those are the concern the present situation [inaudible] current minorities. So one important point of our [inaudible] side is that we really healthy society in Japan but some old people couldn't make a living because of physical reasons. That why the government should protect them. So in comparison the two issue. The first point is that [inaudible] for the young people when more and more elderly people work for society. Our second point that our importance that minorities the elderlies [inaudible]. So under the first point, [inaudible] under the more and more elderly people work, but actually as the first and second speaker said, actually we couldn't take the point. [inaudible] reaction of the [inaudible] pension cost but only reaction [inaudible] five year for people from 65 to-- POI. Sorry. --70, is not actually little or trivial. But [inaudible] the defense of the explanation is that they couldn't actually explain their very concrete situation for the young people, very concrete benefit for the young people. So [inaudible] we couldn't actually see their point. So obviously [inaudible] argue [inaudible] are very trivial. But however in contrast, our second point [inaudible] our minority one. But we have explained that the minorities cannot get public assistance for the [inaudible]. Therefore, they are taking for granted that from 65 to 70 elderly people are very healthy but it's not a thing for granted. Some people might already be difficult to work for their physical reasons. The government should have the awareness. So their work, their pension from the government, they're ignored. They're excluded from the society, as well as from the society. But really, the government know even if they raise the-- sorry.

Good afternoon everyone. So I will summarize this motion. So I have three question. The first question is if elderly people can work or not as the opposition side said that they are not healthy and they can't work because they would break their body. However, it is not true [inaudible]. First, many 70 people are [inaudible] because of the [inaudible] technology. And second, opposition saying that there is only physical labor. No, thank you. However, elderly people can use their knowledge gained through their long life for other work that they can get. So the second question is which is more important, the young people or old people? And our government side strongly believe that young people is more important for society because young people are the future of our country. And we are explaining that burden is very increase because the people between 65 and 70 is a very large number. Also, because of aging society, the young people have to save their money by themselves. Yes? How do the young people pay as pension? How the young people pay as pension is large? How [inaudible]? I'm sorry. I can't understand. Also we explain that there are many [inaudible] older people. For example, [inaudible] so therefore our government [inaudible] for all these reasons, we are [inaudible].