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Hello, everyone. My name is [Yasato?]. Today's topic is, Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. We define pension as much money.

We have two points, and I'll explain the first point. The first point is few people. Japan has much debt in the world. Japan is aging society with fewer children. POI. Yes, please. Can you explain your first point again, please? Yes. First point is fewer people. Japan is aging society with fewer children. It equals that there are few workers in Japan. It's serious problem. For example, taxpayers decrease, so Japan has to make debt. So we can't keep our society. It connect to that we can't live to 70 years old. I'll explain my first point again. Japan has much debt in the world, and Japan is aging society with fewer children. It equals that there are few workers in Japan. It's serious problem. For example, taxes payer decrease, so Japan has to make more debt. So we can't keep our society. It connect to that we can't live to 70 years old. Therefore, I agree this topic. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. Well, today's topic is whether we should raise the pension age to 70 years old. And we strongly believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. And we have two reasons. The first point is moral, and the second point is quality of life; QOL. So I will explain the first point, Japan's moral. Today in Japan retirement-- I'm sorry. I will rebut to the government first point, first. So the government said that because Japan is becoming an aging society and the number of elderly people is actually increasing a lot and there are only a few workers, which means that the amount of tax paid by workers is actually decreasing. However, we strongly believe that because consumption tax will raise to 10% next year, the problem of this will be solved in near future. So even though we don't raise pension age to 70 years old, it really doesn't matter about economy problem. It really doesn't matter, or it doesn't become problem. So I will explain our first point-- POI. Yes, please. Could you explain your [rebuttal?]? Oh, yes. I've said that because consumption tax will raise to 10% next year, which means that we would get more income. So we said that we still have enough income to pay pension from 65 years old.

So I will explain the first point: moral. So today in Japan retirement age is 65 years old. 65 years old. If we raise the pension age to 70 years old, then that means that people who are from 66 to 69 years old will not be paid pension. So there is a five-year gap. People who age to 66 to 69 cannot get pension, which means that they have to live using their savings. You may say that those who are 66 to 69 can also work. Yes, it may be true. But however, the regular employment is not really popular. Many old people are actually volunteers, which means that they cannot get money. So elderly people have to live with their savings. And also this can be said as that Japan is leaving elderly people. Thinking about Japan's moral, it is a not good thing. And also those many people who are 65 years old actually supported Japanese economy growth in 20th century. Japan is developed because they worked very hard for us. We are here, we are so developed now, because they really worked for us. Can you leave them? Well, I think we cannot leave them because they worked for us, and we are actually here because of them. So we strongly believe that we should not raise pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

Sorry [laughter]. Hello, everyone. My name is [Yasakeuchi?]. We believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Let me rebut opposition first point. They said younger depend on elderly people, but it is not true because youngers have a strong dream. And they are not interested in old jobs. The strong dream is look for a good new job. And that is a new interesting things. So it is [inaudible] for development in Japanese economies.

Next, let me reconstruct government's first point. They said Japanese income will be increased. And we can tax more money. But it is not true. The area where increasing income is only big cities. So for example, in [inaudible], is not increased jobs. So we can't tax.

Next time, let me explain our second point. Our second point is healthy life is raising because Japanese medical technology is increasing such as effects of medicine. So we can cure a little time. For example, my aunt getting some medicine, but she is 96 old. So old people can live long time enough. So, therefore, Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. First, let me rebut government's first point. They said that youngers have strong dream, they are not interested in old jobs. But it is not always true. Many some youngers have a dream, but I think that it is not always true.

Next, let me rebut government's second point. We believe that even if healthy lifespan has become longer than before, there are few companies that would hire them. So the old people cannot work.

Next, let me reconstruct opposition's first point. This motion does not tell us that the retirement age will also be raised to 70 years old, and they did not define that as well. So our first points stands in [superior?].

Next, let me explain our second point: quality of life. In present situation, it is a period of aging society in Japan and, surely, life expectancy is extended and the average life expectancy is about 85 years old. However, there are only few people who can move or walk by themselves over 80 years old. It means that they spend long time which they cannot move by themselves. Then what can they do, if they can't get pension? Please think about it. let me explain my great grandmother's example. My great grandmother passed away when she was 90, but she could not move around a lot since she was around 80 years old. She told me that she wished she could have done more fun things when she was able to move around. It means that before is 70 years old. Now, I'd like to emphasize the government's duties. Governments have to protect all citizens' life. It means that by giving pension to people who are in 65 years and 70 years old, governments can protect all citizens' life. Also, we strongly believe that government has duty to keep all people's quality of life. It means that satisfying with their life is very important. We cannot ignore the elderly people's quality of life. It is because they supported our economy in the past by working hard, and now we are giving them less money for a short period. And then, however, if we raise the pension age to 70 years old, those people are not supported to keep their quality of life. They cannot go on trips. Let me explain example they can keep their quality of life. They can go on trips if they can move around, and they can enjoy their remaining life. They could not go when they working hard, so after retirement age and until the death, it is very important to keep quality of life. So we believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. We believe that Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. And first, let me summarise today's debate. The government's point is that there are fewer people in the young generations who can work, and their second point was that the life expectancy has become longer, so there are many people who live to an older age. And on that point, our idea is that to pay pension for the elderly is a moral for the government to maintain a good quality of life for all citizens. This motion has one thing that we have to notice, that what changes in these five years? The present situation, we have a pension from 65 years old. And what happens if we raise it to 70 years old? There is a five years' difference. On their side, it's only a five years' difference. On our side, it is a big difference for us. As my members said, people have supported our economy for a long time. And they have the right to have a good quality of life for the rest of their life. I'm going to explain why I'm talking about these five years. This motion does not tell us that we are going to raise the retirement age to 70, which means in this present situation, with this motion, there are going to be people retiring at 65, but still, they're only going to get pensions at the age of 70. That means people, during those five years from 66 to 69, will have to live on their own. Before, retirement age and the age they get the pension was the same. So they would have a good quality of life over that, so they did not have a five-year gap. But now they have a gap, so that means there will be a bad quality of life. I think this is a very big problem. That is why we think Japan should not raise the pension age to 70 years old. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. My name is [Yuhachida?]. We believe that Japan should raise the pension age to 70 years old. First, let me rebut opposition's second point. They said quality of life. However, I think what experience quality of life. I think long working is evidence to spend their life-- POI. No, thank you. Therefore, I agree the topic.

Then I will summarise today's debate. Today's debate is about what's best, for raise or keep. The most important point is today's life of people in Japan is longer than before. On this point, I believe Japan shouldn't depend on older people. However, our argument is [barrier?]. Their opinion is Japan shouldn't depend on older people. However, I think it's good to depend on them because they have a lot of experience. So it's good. Its opinion is bad. However, our opinion is-- POI.No, thank you. Today people's age is longer than before. So Japan should raise it because Japan have not much money. For example, [inaudible] and medicine bill and so on. If people will increase, government won't pay pension, so it's good to raise it to guard our life. I think older people, their health is increasing. So it's good for us to work with them because it raise the continue life healthy. Therefore, I agree this topic. Thank you.