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Thank you [inaudible]. We strongly believe Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old in order to support aging society. But first of all, let me define this motion [inaudible] pension age to 70 years old for elderly people. What is the meaning of pension? Is to support money for their age who could get job. So if those people work, we don't have to pay money for those people. So after the plan, those people who is between 65 years and 70 years old will start to job again. So I have two argument. The first one is using money for education and support for youngs, and second is solving lack of labor.

So let me explain our first argument. After the plan, first of all, paying money for elderly will reduce, and also, Japanese [inaudible]. So we can't afford to pay money for youngs or for education because government right now has to pay pension for elderly people. [inaudible] so we use that money for [inaudible] in order to support aging society. After the plan, the government can get large amount of money, as I said, because [inaudible] so Japan is also paying money for elderly people, so we can release the money. And also, we can pay the money for youngs and for education. Currently, there is many youngs who is difficult to pay money for education for children. Let me take an example of couple want to give birth but they can't do because they have to pay money for-- if they give birth, they have to pay money for kindergarten or school or college. So those kind of school cost [inaudible] money. So those people are not likely to give birth. After the plan, we can release those money and also we can use the money for education or support for youngs. So those people will be released from those fear and they will give birth. So adoption aging society will be so.Don't you think that your plan is depriving elderly people chance to quit their job at age of 65?But [inaudible] the job. So currently, the elderly people can live longer. They live longer and longer. So they have bigger time after they have step 70 year. So they don't need government to be paying them with [inaudible]. [inaudible] society is very important. Thank you.

Hello everyone. This topic is Japan should not-- we believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. Let me rebut government's first point. They said because this plan, it will leave support for education or support younger people because the elderly pension will be used. However, first of all, pension is needed for the elderly people over the 65 years old because of the age, physically difficult of the doing all our work. No, thank you. So it is needed for the 65 over years old. And also, there is other solution to solve the support for younger people. Pension is not only the solution to support younger people [inaudible]. [inaudible] argument that [inaudible].

Let me explain our points. We have two points. First is job hunting for younger people will be difficult, and second is too much burden for elderly people. First, I will explain the first point. The plan means that we will force the elderly people to work for by 70 years old, so in the current situation, because of the aging society, a lot of elderly people and few young people. There is few young people. So job hunting for young people is already difficult for them because the Japanese company based on the seniority system, which means that working longer people will be regard as important and younger is not. So after the plan, elderly people over 65 years old will have to work longer and because of this, younger people will be difficult to find job or get job or money for their family. So because of the plan, it will bad for the younger people and not better solution to resolve the aging society and for your children. After the plan, the younger people won't be able to get a job, so they don't even get married or even give birth because of the serious condition of financial resource. Because of these reasons, we oppose this motion. Thank you.

Hello everyone. I need to give my speech. First, let me rebut what the previous speaker has said. I think [inaudible] actual difficult for young to find jobs. However, this is not true. In the status quo, because of the aging society, the lack is not offering for jobs, but lack is offering for labor. Companies want to get labor, especially [inaudible]. Companies need labor and young is able to find jobs easily. That is offering in the current situation because of the aging society. So we can say that if we take this plan, it may be a little bit difficult for young people. However, the situation the company are lacking of labor, so young people will be not difficult to search jobs.

Then let me reconstruct our opinion. They said that pension should be paid for people who have physical problem or something like that. That is true. However, this is not a problem in the present situation. And because of the medical techniques improving, many people can live longer, and it means that many people have less physical damage and they're older they get ages. So people who are between 65 to 70s don't have physical damage enough. Yes, please.

Are elderly people willing to work?I don't know. But they think that they should work. It is not uniqueness for every people. Old people don't want to work but they do it for their living to buy food or something like that, and they will do that to live, because they cannot get pension. Yes, please.Why do they have to force elderly people to work?We are not going to force elderly people. They will work just on their will to get enough money. If they have enough money-- no, thank you. If they have enough money, they are able to quit jobs and enjoy the rest of their life.

Then let me tell our second argument. Our second argument is solving lack of labor. As I said, in the status quo, many companies are lack of labor. Many companies want to work. However because of the aging society, there are less children and many company cannot get the labor. No, thank you. Cannot get labor. However, after the plan, many elderly people are going to work because they want to get enough money to live. Then what will happen? We can say that labor between 65 to 70 are going to work, and then company, we can say that labor force-- if the number of labor increase, we can say that economy will improve. But what is important of that is that company income will increase, and then it is also clear that individual income will rise. Then many people can get enough money and they will use it for living, such as food or hobbies and so on. The government duty is to protect citizen life, so we [inaudible] such people if we take this plan, because they can get more-- they can get more money. Thank you.

Hello everyone. We believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. Firstly, let me rebut their first point. In their first point, they said that supporting young people is important. And also, they said that medical technology is improving and people will live longer. But they didn't prove that elderly are willing to work. If they are not willing to work, they will be forced to work five years more. Because if they cannot get pension from the government, they have to work for five years longer, even if they are not willing to. Therefore, their plan is making elderly people's lives harder and this plan should not be accepted. No, thank you.

Now, let me rebut their second point. On their second point, they said that labor shortage is happening and we need more people to support the labor. But this is not true because now, we are in era of technology like AI and robot, and there is estimate that by 2049, almost half of the jobs will be raised AI. No, thank you. So there is no need to increase the labor force.

Now, let me reconstruct our first point. Our first point, we said that the young people will lose their chance to get job, and on this point, they said that there's labor shortage so there's no problem. But as I said before, AI and other robots are developing, and so we don't need more labor force. And if more elderly people work, this is clear that more young people will lose their chance to get job. Therefore, our first point is really strong and very effective to young people.

So now, let me explain our second point. Our second point is about elderly people. So currently, at 65 years old, elderly people will get the chance to quit their job and enjoy their life.And so can you say that AI will exactly develop and it can be [inaudible]?[inaudible] and we are seeing that technology developing. Like our iPhone is developing every year and our technology is actually developing every year. So the possibility is really high. So let's back to our second point. Our second point is about elderly people and currently, by 65 years old, they will get chance to quit their job and enjoy their life. After they quit their job, they can enjoy hobby like Shogi or [inaudible] or something like that. But if we adopt this plan, this means Japan's government will force elderly people to work five more years, because elderly people cannot get pension from 65 to 70 years old and they have to work to make their living. So this plan will make elderly people's lives harder, so we should not take this plan. Thank you.

Hello everyone. Today, we believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. I will summarize today's debate. The most important point is that to raise the pension age is how affect elderly people and this plan make elderly people's happiness or not, and how affect on society. On this point, they said that after the plan, money will be used for education so it's good. However, it means after the plan, elderly people will be forced to suffer for education, because they have to work until 70 years old and all of life should be respected. In addition, we still have solution to solve education problem. For example, to cut [inaudible] salaries. So there's all sorts of-- there are other way to solve this problem so why we have to suffer the elderly people even if they have difficulty [inaudible]? So we don't have to do so. And also, we say that we will not force elderly people. However, it's not true. After the plan, elderly people have to work in order to earn money, even if they have difficulty. So there are people who cannot make enough because of age, so those who cannot work enough-- so those who cannot work enough will [inaudible] pension. So if the pension will disappear until they're 70 years old, they will suffer a lot and they cannot get money for their lives after the plan. It's problem. It's serious problem. Because they have to work even if they have difficulty, and it's not good for elderly people. So the plan will suffer the elderly people. And also, they talk about the lack of labor shortage. However as our previous speaker said, that after the plan, the job hunting will be difficult for younger people because if elderly people have to work until 70 years old, a number of people will have to work and be [inaudible], so many jobs will be replaced by elderly people. It's unequal society. Therefore, we strongly oppose this plan. Thank you.

[inaudible]. Hello everyone. We have three points. The first point is-- first of all, let me rebut what the previous speaker has said. He said that AI is developing and also elderlies and not willing to work. However, this is not true. I will explain later. And the three points; our first point is which is better for youngs? And second point is which is better for elderly people? And thirdly which is better for society? So let me explain one by one. Firstly, which is better for youngs? They said that this plan deprive youngs of their chance to get jobs. However as my partner said, many companies seek more labor. And also, AI will never replace because there are a lot of work which AI cannot do. For example training children or nursing or something like that. So youngs will be able to get jobs. And secondly, which is better for elderly? They said that elderly people don't want to work and government force them to work. However, we will never deprive elderly people of their rights to quit their jobs. Because if they have enough money, they can quit jobs. No, thank you. And also, life expectancy has been longer because of developing medical technology. No, thank you. So elderly people can enjoy their hobbies. And finally, which is better for society? After the plan, Japan will have more labor creation. It leads Japanese economy to improve. When it happen, it will increase citizen's income as we said. If they get much more money, they can life in [inaudible] because they can use money for [inaudible]. So this plan can make Japan better for everyone, so we should take this plan. Thank you.