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Hello, everyone. Today's topic is Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. We define that if the person have income at age of 65 years old, Japanese government should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Our stance is all of the Japanese can be happy. We have two points. The first point is reducing the government debt. The second point is will be explained the second person.

I will explain the first point. The first point is reducing the government's debt. If the person raised the pension age to 70 years old--Point of information. Okay. What kind of pension will you raise? Pension? What kind of pension will you raise? Pension. Sorry, I can-- Okay. Thank you. If the government raised the pension age to 70 years old, the government debt will be reduced. Recently the government debt continuous increasing, so the Japanese government have decided to raise the consumption tax to 10%. So the Japanese people just have to [inaudible] about it. And also a lot of shops, for example, restaurants have to [inaudible] with it because they have to change the price of the something. And they will be concerned about the people that will be not come to the restaurant or some place. But if the Japanese government raised the pension age to 70 years old, the government don't have to raise the consumption tax because we don't have to cover the debt by the-- Point of information. Okay. Why can you say that reduction cost is enough for government because Japanese debt is really huge. Pardon me? Why can you say that the cost that will be reduced by introducing this plan is enough for government? Because Japan-- elderly Japanese people are increasing and so the Japanese government have to pay a lot of money to the older people. Point of information. Okay. Why is it important to reduce debt? Please explain why is it important? Because, for example, in the Greece, the Greece had a lot of debt in 2009 that the Greece is bothered about the amount of taxing [inaudible] the Greece have a lot of trouble about money. And the government have to-- so the government have to raise the consumption tax to [inaudible] the government debt. Therefore, our argument does stand. Thank you.

Thank you, chairperson. My name is [Vic Sulo?]. I will start my speech. First, I will rebut their first point. They say that we can reduce the debt of government by this plan. However, there is some kind of pension that company paid to people. So importance is small. And also our second speaker questioned that debt is so huge in Japan. So the reduction costs of pension is not enough to reduce the [inaudible] debt. So totally their first point is weak.

I'll explain our first point. Sorry. I'll introduce our points. First point is suffer from financial problem for elderly people. And second one is complaint of elderly people. I'll explain our first point. Our first-- now, from 65 years old we can get pension. And so the gap between retirement age and pension age is small. So that means we can live with small burden. However, if we add up this plan the big problem will happen, because the retirement age and the pension age [inaudible] gap will become wide. So that means we have-- elderly people have to live with cutting their savings until they can get a pension. And even if they won't do work, it is difficult for elderly people to get job enough in [commonsense?]. And so this plan will lead elderly people to huge and final [inaudible] they will worry about money. So their final situation become very, very bad. And, for example, only with pension they worry about the money, even though they have a pension. So that means if they don't have pension, they will have very big, big financial problem. And also they difficult to get job and so maybe in many cases-- there's many cases that people don't have enough money to live. To even to live. So this plan has a big, big [inaudible] leads to big, big problem to elderly people. So we strongly believe that we should not adopt this plan. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 17 years old. Let me rebut the opposition's first point. They said there is gap between retirement job and the start of the pension age. We already defined that the people who don't have income at the age of 65, they can get the pension and if the person have income at the age of 65, they can't get the pension. So that wouldn't be the problem.

And next, let me reconstruct government's-- Point of information. No thank you. They said many kinds of pension, but I don't think so. Pension means the money which is paid to [inaudible] persons and so the first speaker said about that and that doesn't stand.

Then let me explain our second point. The number of [stable?] worker. Today we have people who work or service jobs. Many people work for service jobs such as salesclerk, and people work for tourism. But we don't have enough people to work for traditional industry. If this idea will be accepted, the [stable?] people who lost their job at the age of 65, then they can get the job for traditional industry. They may get that job for traditional industry, such as they-- Point of information. Yes, please. Do you think that such people can do a better job in traditional work? I think such job need a very, very skilled work. Yeah, but there are some. Yes, if [service?] they can-- I think they can work for their jobs such as cleaner for schools [inaudible]. In my school, the [silver?] people work for clean that school. And so that's my [inaudible] I mean, not [inaudible] just not industry, but [silver?] people can get more jobs so it be good idea. So therefore, Japan should raise the pension age to 17 years old. Thank you.

Thank you, chairperson. I will start my speech. First, I will rebut to their first point. They said that by raising the pension age to 70 years old, government debt will be reduced. But as I said, or as our first speaker said, reduction cost is not enough to solve the debt problem for the government because Japanese debt is really huge. They can't solve it. So their first point doesn't stand.

And also, next let me rebut to their second point. They said that the elderly people can get the job of traditional industry, or something like that. But they didn't explain-- as our first speaker said, traditional industry's job will be required the really skilled work, is skilled work. So the traditional worker should have the skill that is sophisticated. So-- Point of information. Sorry. So their second point doesn't stand. And also they talked about the cleaner of the school, but it has no uniqueness.

Let me reconstruct our first point. Actually, they didn't attack any effective point of our first point because our first point is financial burden. And our first speaker-- their first speaker didn't do the effective attacks. So our first point still stands.

Next, I will explain our second point. Our second point is complaint of elderly people. Complaint of elderly people. In the present situation, elderly people is defined as people who are over 65. If we introduce this plan, at 65 to 69 elderly people will get unsatisfied, unsatisfied. Because they also pay or accumulate money to get pension in the future. If we adopt this plan, elderly people who are from 65 to 69 feel such no equality between 65 to 69 elderly people, and over 70 people. So such elderly people will complain to government, "Why under 70 elderly people can't receive enough money or enough service?" So that is the problem. People should be equal as the Japanese Constitution says. So we strongly believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old to protect the human equality. Thank you.

Thank you, chairperson. My name is [inaudible]. First, I will explain the most important point. The most important point on this debate is the possibility and the impact on elderly people whose age is 65 to 70. The possibility and impact on elderly people who's age is 65 to 70. Please imagine if you were elderly people, your age is 65 to 70, and having paid for the pension for a long time and this motion was introduced. What do you feel? You [certainly?] get angry because you cannot get a pension. As our second speaker said, it will be [inaudible] burden or [nothing?]. And please compare their first point and our first point on the point of the [concreteness?]. They said the Japanese debt will be reduced. But they didn't explain why is it so important and we cannot imagine how important and the why-- we didn't believe the money is enough for introducing this plan. So their first argument has no impact. And our first argument is their career target of the 65 to 70 people. So our first argument has for clear effect and clear impact. So our first point is superior to their first point.And let me refute their second point. They didn't explain the uniqueness-- we didn't understand the process and impact of their second point. So their second point has no impact. Okay. Thank you.

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 about complaining. However, it is different so letting the person after 70 years old who have jobs [inaudible]. Therefore, it is nothing [inaudible].

So I will summarize today's debate. The most important point is the way that all [advanced?] people will be happy. And what [inaudible] called? Our argument is [inaudible]. Because if people are given pensions, government role will decrease. So Japan can keep same consumption tax. So they will be happy because we don't need much money. And if we don't have pension on 65 years old, how do you think about their incomes. Maybe we want jobs. [inaudible] keep over the 65 years old. And the young people get [inaudible] of traditional jobs. [inaudible]. Therefore, government should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.