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Hello, everyone. Today's topic is Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. We define that we collect money from young people and give it to the elderly people. I mean, we don't change the current pension system. We have two points. The first point is what [inaudible] and revenues. The second point is retirement age.

I will explain the first point, what [inaudible] and revenue. We believe that Japan needs an aging society without [inaudible]. In Japan, the number of the elderly people is increasing rapidly because technology has improved and we can cure serious injuries that we can't cure in the past. And we can prevent many diseases now. On the other hand, the number of newborn babies is decreasing. In the future, the government can collect less and less money because the number of working people will decrease. So the government will run out of money for a pension. In addition, Japan has a [inaudible] now. So if the government issue more government bonds to continue the current pension system, Japan will be-- sorry. And Japan will be in financial trouble. Therefore, we believe that-- Point of information. Okay. We understand that the government does not have money, but why does the government have to take money from weak people? Not like consumption tax or other taxed income? Why do you have to take money from these weak elderlies? We say that we collect money from young people. I mean, young people are working, so they have much money then elderly people I think. So I think your attack is not relevant. Therefore, we believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. That's all. Thank you for listening.

Hello, everyone. We believe that this motion will endanger the weakest people's lives. So that's why we are proud to oppose this motion. First of all, let me make some rebuttal to the first argument. In the first argument, they said that we can collect money by introduce this motion. However, first think about the reason why you have to include the plan is to protect the weakest people. However, actually, this motion will endanger the weakest people as we show in our first argument. So this can never be justified as a government option. And moreover, there is so many alternative solutions to raise money, such as raising the income tax, or raising the consumption tax [inaudible]. So this is wrong for the government stance and moreover, there is so many alternative solutions. So [it's uniqueness?] quite low. So their first argument can never stand.

Next, let me move on to our arguments. Today we have two arguments. The first argument is that to protect the weakest people. And second point is that it is wrong for the government stance. As for the second point, my partner will explain later. So our first point is that we have to protect the weakest people, that's older people. In the current situation, the elderly people can get pension from 65 years old. And also, their retirement age is 65 years old. So it means that the elderly people can get pension as soon as they get retired. And also in the country, there are so many weak elderly people who cannot work after their retirement because of physical condition and their body will get weaker and weaker as they get old. And moreover, they will catch some diseases like cancer, or injury and so on. So like every condition, it is very difficult for them to work after their retirement. And moreover, even if they try to work, its income is lower than other workers. Like if after retirement, their income will significantly decrease to 30% before retirement. And moreover, there are so many lonely elderly people. This number is increasing due to the [inaudible] society. Still there are so many other people who can never work who do not have any property. And who do not have the family. So after they've taken this motion, after their retirement, they will lose all source of the income. So they do not have any income at all. And mostly they do not have the property. Still, it is only the pension they can depend on. However, after retirement, they will lose their pension system. So they can never rely on other [plans?]. So this is the first significant problem for the older people, especially weakest people. [inaudible]. Yes. You said we think that there are other supporting systems and not only pensions, but how do you think about that?

So, okay. It is true there are some other options. However, if some other option is quite limited because for example, public assistance system can be provided for only the limited people. Such as they can never have the car, so they can never have the houses. This can be provided on only limited people. However, pension system can provide for all the elderly people. This system is [inaudible] pension. And moreover, so this-- during the five years, or since the 65 years or 75 years old, they can never get any income. So they will lose-- they may not get enough food and they will lose the home. And moreover, they cannot go to hospital, even if they get diseases. Or even if their body gets weaker and weaker. So we can say that these people have to have a miserable life in this more than five years. And moreover, these people's lives will get endangered after the plan. So that's why we are proud to oppose this motion, thank you.

Okay. So, first I'm going to attack your first opinion. Or you said that, or to protect the youngest people is very important. And you said that-- Weakest. [inaudible]. Oh, the weak, weak people. Or you said like the weak people are very important, but then you said that the example or the weak people is like elderly person, right? No? Yeah, right? So actually, or the [inaudible] is also seen first after the elderly people retirement, you can get the retirement money. And actually they may have some stocks. So not all the-- Point of information. Sorry. Not all the-- or the elderly are not always are weak. And some have some stocks. And so-- Point of information. Sorry.

Next I'm going to talk about our second point. Our second point is the retirement age can earn money. First, I'm going to share the example [The Skylab Blues?]. The [Skylab Blues?] are an extension of the retirement age from 70 to 75. It means that-- the first [inaudible] are the retirement age can work like until they become 75 years old. It means that our old-- the retirement person can earn the money and their money helps them [inaudible]. And [inaudible] they're old, retired their job, when they become 60 or 65. So it is very important to give the patient-- or when they become the sick-- Point of information. Sorry-- 65 years old. But now we can-- the elderly person can work until the 75 years. And let's think about a case of the person who can't work because they have some body problems. Or, do you know the national insurance? Or is that only with the Japanese have to join our national insurance. If you joined the national insurance or if you become 65 years old, the 65 years old means that they have to do retirement. Or some of them have to retirement. Or they can get money by their national insurance. [inaudible] our second point is that retirement age can earn money now. That's all.

We believe that this plan will endanger the weakest people'in society. And this is completely against the purpose of the government and the government's stance. So first let me refute their second argument first. They explain that there is some elderly people who could work until they're 70 years old. However, we believe that we will like to focus on people who cannot work until they're 70. And we believe that making these people work until their 70s mean that the government is forcing them to work. And we believe that this act cannot be justified. And we will explain this in our second argument.

And they also explain their second argument that there are about [inaudible] people who cannot work. And these people can receive insurance. However, please look at the present situation. Currently, the system of national insurance has already taken place. However, there's still elderly people who are suffering. And we believe that we cannot change the situation.

So let me move on to our second argument today. Our second argument today is that we cannot justify this action of the government. Especially because-- and we would like to focus on the fact that the government is doing this. So first we would like to explain the government's duty and the government's purpose. And then we'll explain how would the plan change this. And about the first point. We believe that the government's duty is to protect the weakest people in society. And protect all of the citizens of the country. And, for example, the government has a lot of public services. And these kind of things [inaudible] tax the citizens. And let's compare this to after the plan. After the plan-- Point of information. No thank you. This plan means raising the age that we can receive pension to 70 means that people who cannot work during-- people between 65 to 70 will not be able to receive pension at all after the plan. And these people are quite weak because they do not have any income. So the government will be taking away money from these weak people. And we believe that this point cannot be justified. And this is completely against the government stance. And rather, the government should take more money from younger people. So there's an alternative and we believe that this action cannot be justified.

So finally, I would like to reconstruct their first argument and refute their first argument as well. In their previous-- if they explain the people who retired have stock, or money from retirement. And they explain that not everyone who retired are weak. However, they never deny the fact that there are weak people and there are people who need help. And we need to save these people-- POI. Oh, yes? You said that the government should take money from the young people, but what is young people? The person who is 30, the working [inaudible] the working or--? Okay. So what we would like to focus on is that the people who are 65 to 70, these people are really weak. So younger people who have a lot more money and they're working, these people-- so what we want to say is that we do not want to take money away from the weakest people about 65 to 70 years old. And this plan will be taking away money from these people, and this cannot be justified. And also let me move back to reconstruction. They said that for most people, there are many elderly weak people and for these people, we need this plan. Thank you.

Okay, I'd like to start. The opposition [inaudible] I'd like to ask you a few questions. First, by this plan, whether elderly people can have enough life or not? Second point is about whether earning money, government earning money by depriving like socially weak people's money can be justified or not. About the first point, about elderly's life. We want to understand most of people quit their jobs in 60 years old. And even if they work after that, their income is extremely small. Which means even if they work after 60 years old, their income is less than 30% or just really small amount, including [inaudible] of life. As a result, many people over 60 years old are really poor in their life. They are socially weak people. So we think the government have to support their life by like social welfare, or the pension systems. However, once we give these people like welfare to only people older than 70 years old, they will lose their income for more than five years old, which means they cannot earn any money for five years. So we think it's really serious problems because they have no food, no income, no money. They cannot even go to hospital. It's really miserable life, and we can never admit these situations. So they say like elderly people can work, but the people who can work is so limited because some people are really weak bodies, they cannot even work. And even if they work, their income is so small. So we think they cannot have enough life by this plan. So this should give us a lot of alternatives, like insurance system, or welfare system. But these can be provided for only small amount of people, so you have very really like a who is very poor. Like most of the elderly. So most of the people are in lack of money. They cannot have enough sustainable life for more than five years. It's very significant for them. Next about we want to ask you whether the government can justify this action or not. Which means, yes, we understand government does not have enough money. They have to earn money. However, why does the government have to earn money by depriving people from money from weak people, which means government have to earn money to protect people, right? But why does the government have to earn money from these 60 years to 70 years old people, who does not have enough money? We think rather than doing these things, government should raise consumption tax, or income tax. Which means government should take money from the people who already have money, not by taking money from the really socially weak people. So we think this action can never be justified as the government's purpose. So if government does not have money, they should take money in other solutions. They can never deny our alternative. They can never explain why government have to take money from these socially weak people. So in order to protect these socially weak people's life, and we think the government can never justify like to deprive money from these people. That's why we [inaudible]. Thank you very much.

Hello, everyone. We believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. First, let me rebut opposition's second point. They said that the change of the system is completely against the government. However, although they said the government is forcing people to work until 70 years old by changing this system. Now, if that's true, the government is forcing people to work until 65 years old. So there is a contradiction between your points. Point of information. However, now everyone can receive pension system from 60 years old, right? But in your plan, they can have nothing to do for five years. What's the difference? Okay. Okay. On our second point we mentioned that there is an extension of the retirement age in most of the companies in this country. So it is not that relevant. Point of information. Sorry.

Let me summarize today's debate. The most important thing is that Japan has no spare money to waste on healthy people. On this point, their idea is that we should support the weak people. First, we want to support people who are really in need, and not waste money on the healthy people, which this country, Japan, doesn't have much money, anyway. They said that the weakest people are the elderlies. But the people who have just started working are the same, and they don't earn much money. So to follow the government's purpose, we must provide money to those who have just started working, so it's the same. And it [inaudible] the government-- Point of information. sorry-- opinion anyway. Our first point was [inaudible] life expectancy is [inaudible] raising, but there is no spare money, tax revenues, or waste of and although there are more and more elderly to support, there are less working people to pay money in. And Japan's national [rule?] must adapt to the recent situation. And our second point was that the extension of the retirement age can let elderlies work until later age. And the elderlies have to really need to work because of development of the technology, so there is no need for us to support the elderlies, the healthy elderlies. Point of information. Sorry. The elderlies with serious problems can depend on other systems, such as national insurance. Therefore, we strongly believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.