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Hello, everyone. Today's topic is, "Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old." We define that, by raising the pension age, we mean this by every kind of pension. By pension, we mean this by an amount of money paid regularly by the government or company. We have two points. The first point is social welfare will be remained. And the second point is reduced burden on the young generation. The most important thing is that make a sustainable and comfortable future for everyone. For everyone. First, focusing on this point.

The first point is social welfare will be remained. We believe that raising the pension age is a necessary thing for us. In the present situation, social welfare is rising year by year. Social welfare is a welfare right for elderly people or diseased. And in 2025, the welfare will be 135 trillion yen. This is more than 20% compared by GDP. In addition, the debt of our country is rising year by year, and it is now 1,000 trillion yen in 2018. We need more money to protect our generation. By keeping this situation, the money of Japan will be lost. How we can compare it? Because of this, Japan can't repay all social welfare. The victim of this is all generation's people. By following this motion, if the 65 to 70 people will be saved money, but if we don't take this motion, we can't get money in any kind of situation like disease, nursing, and so on. We can know the serious burden this is. Sure enough, we can't be saving anyway by government because of the lack of money. We need new options to save all generation people. The people who are in the 65 to 70 ages will always suffer when they are the age of 65 to 70. However, if we don't take this motion, all people will suffer from burdens through their whole lives, which is more serious. In addition, the suffering of the 65 to 70 people is very small things. They do not need the pensions. Why? Because the risk of getting a disease is getting higher and higher. The life expectancy of Japan is getting higher. And predictions say that the life expectancy will rise to 85 years old for men and 91 years old for women. This clearly shows that, as the life expectancy is getting older and people are living longer because they are more healthy people, this means that because people are living longer and more healthy lives, those from 65 to 70 do not need the pension because they are more healthy. So we can say that the hurting of these people, 65 to 70 people, is a very small thing. So in this situation, by comparing the sufferers of all generations and only the 65 to 70 people, we should protect the all generations' people by raising the pension age to 70 years old and save the money for all generations' social welfare. So the most important things, again, are make a sustainable and comfortable future for everyone. So everyone means that all generations, not always the same 65 to 70 of people. So, therefore, Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you. [applause]

Hello. We believe that Japan should raise the pension age of 70 years old. And let me rebut what the government team said. Sorry, I can't understand what you said.

Next, let me explain our first point-- explain our point. We have two points. The first point is some people should wait for 10 years. Some people should wait for 10 years. The second point is it becomes [an echo?] of the-- Amount. --amount to get pensions. I will explain the first point. Some people should wait for 10 years. We believe that the retirement age is 60 in Japan now. Japan have a system of mandatory retirement at age 60, and the age at which a pension is paid is 65 years old. But, if Japan raise the pension age to 60 years old, we have the blank 5 years to get pension. So some people have blank five years to get pension. So people that didn't work, they have-- POI. No, thank you. They have a big burden. They should wait to get pension for 10 years. It is so hard to wait for the people that didn't work when they're young. Their burden will become big. POI. Thank you. Yes? How can you say that those people's burden is more serious than the people of all generations? As we said in our [constructed?] speech, all generations will be suffer if we don't take this motion. But how can you say--? I beg your pardon? How can you say that this is more serious than the situation we don't take this motion? Some people didn't work at their young, so they don't have money to keep with them. So when they raise the pension age to 70 years old, they can't get money more 5 years. In Japan, the system of-- in Japan, the [retired?] pension is paid age 60 years old, so they can't have 5 years to get pension. Therefore, Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you. [applause]

Yeah, it's okay. [inaudible]. In this debate, we believe that we should make a sustainable and comfortable future, and a comfortable society for everyone. Please focus on this point [inaudible] in this debate. Now, I rebut opposition's first point. On their first point, they say that people need their social welfare as soon as they get the 60 years old. However, they never explain why it's a big burden. They just kept on saying that it's a big burden on the people. However, they never explained how it's a burden this big. And also, I have [to reject?] this point. At first, people can get the retirement allowance when they retire from their work. That's why they can get enough money when they get the 60 years old. That's why they don't need the money as soon as they get the 60 years old. And second, as we said in our first point, their disease risk will raise up as they get older and older. That's why people between the 60 years and 70 years old need some kind of help. However, it's not that different from the other people who are over 60 years old. And so, after they get the 80 years old and 90 years old, they tend to-- are getting to some disease. And that's why they need the social welfare. Maybe the people between the 60 years old and 70 years old don't necessarily need the social welfare. That's why their first point [doesn't stand?].

Now, I reconstruct our first point. Their first point, they said they couldn't understand, so I'll explain our first point again. So we believe that if we don't take this motion, the social welfare in Japan would decline and [wreck?] them at the worst case. This is really bad because no one can-- POI. Yes? That there are many burden-- very money in the society. Right? So I can't understand why are you saying social welfare is so-- Oh, okay. So, as we said in our first point, that expenditure in social welfare is rising, and that it reached also [inaudible] trillion yen. That's why it is really a big burden on society. So we need a reduce our expenditure. And we believe that it will remain the social welfare to all people, including the working age, and also the elderly the people.

And I'll explain our second point. Our second point: reduce burden on younger generation. As we see that, in our first point, expenditure on social welfare is very, very big burden on Japanese society. And it burdens the young generation, including the working age and also ours, like students or some young age. So it forces us to pay more taxes, and also, actually, the government's raised payment of consumer taxes from 8% to 10%. So, yeah. This is not so big burden on young ages right now, but we believe that, as we said that before, the expenditure for social welfare is rising and will [age?] more a big burden on the society. And in that sense, the government will force us to pay all the kinds of taxes, like their other taxes, other than only the consumer taxes. That's why this will be very big burden on elderly people, including the younger age and the working age. That's why we oppose this motion strongly. Thank you.

Okay. Hello, everyone. I'm [inaudible] [Sogami?] and I'm from the [inaudible] high school. And let me rebut opposition's first point. They said that social welfare is decreasing, and so young generation's burden is increasing, so they should raise the pension age to 70 years old. But I can't agree this opinion because we should cut down financial [inaudible] first. Right? Because lack of the amount of paying pensions should supply by another source of revenue. POI. No, thanks. Such as [inaudible] and salary of [diet?] because Japanese [diet?] salary is the second highest in the world. So we should cut down their salary and input to the pension first, I think. So your opinion is not make sense. And many people are suffering from disease before becoming 65. We have to guarantee their income to have a culture and basic human life. They said that we have to make a sustainable life and comfortable life, but if we can get a pension before 65, it also makes sense so we have the support after retiring. Now, many older people becoming poor because they can't get enough pension to protect-- for example, I lived in Fukushima for two years, and in that time so many people can't turn on any heat, even if temperature is minus 10 degrees because they haven't enough pension. So they can't have a culture and basic human life. So we shouldn't change pension age to 70 and you don't make any sense. And-- POI. No, thanks. And before raising the pension age to 70 year old, all people who is more than 65 years old get pension. But, after changing this law and raising its pension age to 70 year old, it becomes unequal of the amount who get pensions. Everyone started to put money from 20 to 65 but, if this law accept, some people have to pay from 20 to 65 and other people must pay from 20 to 70. This five years is unequal, isn't it? And the amount of getting makes quite a big difference because of these five years. This unequal also-- amount of paying pension is different, so it also make unequal. So, therefore, Japan shouldn't raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you very much.

Yes. Hello, everyone. We believe that Japan shouldn't raise the pension age to 70 years old. Let me summarize today's debate. The most important point is living without any working for old generation people. I mean, not only being well-off but only living without any working. On this point, their idea is harmful for young generation. Five years young generation. They think it a small thing, but don't at all. However, our argument is superior because if Japan raised the pension age to 70 years old we have the blank five years to get pension. I'm sure that Japanese government will not be able to [bury?] this blank. By doing so, the number of poor people will be increased. This will be a really big problem for Japan in the future. If we rise up the age blank of 10 year make only decreasing their savings, so people run out of savings. And we have to guarantee their income to have a cultural and basic human life. So, therefore, Japan shouldn't raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

We believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. So first, let me rebut to the opposition's second point. So throughout their second point, they kept on talking about how there's going to be unequal payment for people because some will have to pay until 65, whereas others will have to pay for 75. However, when those who are 65 currently, they will have a pension when they're older. That is the fundamental idea of social welfare. And by implementing this motion, they will be able to be paid when they are 70. Therefore, there won't be any kind of inequality between these two groups.

Next, let me summarize today's debate. So throughout today's debate, the opposition side kept on talking about the five years of blank that these people will have. However, as our second speaker stated, firstly these people will get retirement allowances. They won't go without any money, and they won't just live on without having nothing in their wallet. They're going to have some kind of allowance that will allow them to have a life that is like a human, as the opposition side have kept on saying. They will have these allowances that the government has already made and specified for which kind of amount they need. Additionally, as we have kept on saying, those who are from 65 to 75, although some may need help, there are others who aren't even using the social welfare during those five years. Because life expectancy is getting older, that shows that there are people who are living longer. And there are people who are living more healthier lives, which means that these people who are from 60 to 70 do not necessarily need these pensions in order to pay for their health. So I would just like to state, that we have stated in our first point, that we are talking about everyone's social welfare. Not just about those who are older, also about those who are in the younger generation and those who are in our generation, so we can have a sustainable life in the future. We will have one in the future by having this kind of motion because there will be social welfare for everyone. Everyone will be protected, whereas on their [debate] they only kept on talking about this blank five years, which can be prevented through having this motion because-- POI. Yes? But we have that case study that we said, that people have five blanks, paying blanks, so that case-- However, that is the fundamental idea of social welfare. They're going to all get an equal amount of pay when they're 70. Therefore, we propose this motion. Thank you.