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The uniqueness of microchip implants is always with the body. We don't drop it, lose it, or forget to have it. This is important and this is the importance and reduce risk. That's why we propose this motion. So first I would define the motion as follows. First this motion will be taken after they secure about their [inaudible] of health. Second, from the microchip the government can only see the basic information like name and passport number. Like passport numbers. So it's [strictly?] independent. So our [inaudible] is here today.Point of information?No, thank you. So we have two point. The first point is government can recognize people and the second point is identification.

So first I will explain the first point. government can recognize people. In current situation we have no way to specify who they are because we cannot-- so we cannot quickly to find the person. So for example in Tōhoku big earthquake we cannot find who they are that-- the Tōhoku earthquake cause a very big tsunami. However, the families or some government cannot specify the people, so they cannot find our families or someone loved one or something. So this is very bad thing for us. So if we can take this motion we can absolutely [inaudible] they are. Because all people should have a microchip implant in their own body. So as we said in our definition the government can see the basic information. So we can specify the people even if they would die or we cannot understand who they are looks like or something. So this motion can improve the possibility of specify who they are so we can-- this is a [inaudible] secure [inaudible]. So why it is very important because this motion can save more people because we can know the data base or something. So we can know how many people are injured by earthquakes--Point of information.--earthquakes or the tsunami or something. So we can clearly [inaudible] the people will do some surgery or some treatment for them. Because the government can know about their data because they have a micro-- they have microchips. So it is very good effect for them, and also we can easily to know how big the harm. So we can connect some futures we should do something like the treatment what happened for the earthquake. We should do some treatment or something and also we can possibility of-- we can increase in the possibility of specify. This means that we can protect [inaudible] life and also family can meet the someone who are die by some accident. So it is very good effect for our [inaudible]. So we are propose this motion. Thank you.

Okay. So in this debate the government side had two kind of the [inaudible]. [inaudible] first is about the [inaudible]. So even though there are some existence for example [inaudible] microchip or a [inaudible] in the prepaid card in the [inaudible] machine, why do we have to take [inaudible] in order to achieve their goals? They have to produce point. And second is about safe or not. Of course, they said define a motion like government will check or consider whether or not those [inaudible] metal chip is safe or not. However, we cannot understand why those [inaudible] will be secured after the regulation. Because even if-- we have two [inaudible]. One, how they evaluate. So why the government have to evaluate 100 [inaudible]. And also if we can see it is perfectly safe, how can we say? Is there some risk even with [inaudible]? So on this point we have to consider the risk of the microchip. So in this debate we have to talk about this point. So first of all, I'll quickly [inaudible] what they said in the first argument. They said specify a lot of people or dead victim because of the earthquake. We have two kind of [inaudible]. First is about [inaudible] after regulation only the government can know where the victims are. So on this point their relatives or the family cannot know where their family or their sister or children are. So on this point it is important for the family or relatives know as soon as possible. Why? So for this reason so there are long-term barrier or obstacle for them to know information. On this point there are [inaudible] quite unclear. And second the problem is about even if they can find where their family or relative is they cannot get those victim because they're too deep from the sea or they're too far from the mountain. So even if by using the [inaudible] or a kind of power is not impossible.[inaudible]?No, thank you. Like secured those people. So this is a problem. So even if [inaudible] those people we cannot save and we can get people from [inaudible] to their family places, right? So on this point [inaudible] we cannot say that their importance is so big.

Next, we talk about our first argument that [inaudible]. First point is about health damage and second argument is a risk of abuse of the information. So on this point my partner will explain later. First, I will talk about my first argument. So health damage. So [inaudible] some [inaudible] who don't want to be or they must not be taking microchip for example baby or elderly or [middle aged?] who are pregnant. For example the baby [inaudible] are sensitive so they don't have immune so they cannot do this. So to get [inaudible] what is worth if [inaudible] they take microchip in their body for example what is for example there will be an anaphylactic shock, right? And the [inaudible] so they're the future or the dream will be deprived from just putting in microchips by their body. So what is [inaudible]? Because just putting in those microchip or [inaudible] every [inaudible] in life they [inaudible] a personality or the [inaudible]. So for example so even though the normal people putting in microchip for long time we cannot take out because too deep, right? So even if we know there's a risk of the person's health risk we [inaudible] too late, right? So we cannot put it out. So on this situation we cannot say that those person will be secured after the regulation. So it is too late. However, once we take this from [inaudible] notice our body is bad for putting in metal pieces. So it is too late. For example elderly people is too old and they tend to be weak. So once they have allergy or anaphylactic shock happens, it is hard and they will die. So for this reason we think that a lot of people will be harmed. Health conditions will get worse after regulation. That's why we oppose this motion. Thank you

We have to protect the citizens' life and we know about it. So when we can secure the citizens' life then the motion should be approved. So let me clarify the definition first. The citizens will be controlled by the government-- the government will control the citizens' data and the government will [inaudible] have the responsibility for it. That means that citizens have to make checkups and they have--Point of information.Sorry. They have to pay if they don't-- the citizens have to pay if they don't follow this rule. So because the government has a responsibility according to the definition. So for example in medicine actually governments have to prove that it is safe for citizens. So in the microchips they also have to prove for it. So let me rebut the affirmative side first point. They talked about the health damage that there could be some damage to the person like citizens. However this motion will be taken only after when it is secured about the risk of health. So we are not saying in the present situation that it has to be done right now according to the definition.Point of information.Sorry. Also if there are people like elderly people have allergies and [inaudible] we cannot prove that they always identification card, so in such kind of situation we need to have those chips in order to protect them and have to have a quicker surgery because we need to the identification code for such kind of thing.

So let's move on to the first one. Reconstruction. Our first one was about-- the government can recognize. So the government already have to recognize whether the people are safe. So the negative side rebutted to us what if the people it's under deeply in the ocean. That is such [inaudible]. However, please think about the possibility if we can save more people by introducing this motion. So there are many people dying under for a normal places outside. So in such kind of situation we can help them.

So [inaudible] second point identification. There are so many different crimes happening in Japan and some people will try to escape from Japan. So what will happen if we take this motion? First if we can identify who in a short term because the government has the database who enter--Point of information--sorry, who get out of the country. And secondly the government makes them easier to check people's movement and [inaudible]. Thirdly, when there are criminals we can identify who is who. And so this is important in a situation such kind of kidnapping and such things where we need quick things to solve this problem then we can use the chip in a very short term so we can solve more problems by introducing this motion. So that's why to secure the citizens why we should introduce this motion. Thank you

So the government's side has to prove the necessity of microchips why we have to use the microchips even if there are alternative way. And also the [inaudible] find that after the government can stop the risk we introduce this motion. However why government can [inaudible] that there is no risk? We cannot understand that. The risk is too big so that's why we--[inaudible]?--sorry, people should not have a microchips implant in their own body. So first let me rebut their point. On the first point they mentioned about when the disaster we can find the victims. However as our first speaker said as far as government keep that information so why family can find the victims easily because of [inaudible] with that information. So the time that take to find victims will not change. So their effect is very, very small. And on the other hand our risk is more clearly and [inaudible]. So our point is superior.

And so [inaudible] to the second point. They talked about we can find a criminal easily. However, at first the probability is low. That how many criminals go out of the nation so we cannot say that it is very useful on--[inaudible]?Sorry. So and also if the criminal is a bad criminal we want to find by the police and the criminal will get out the microchip out of the body by the operation. So we cannot say the effect is clear because the criminal can get out their microchips. So their point doesn't stand.[inaudible]?Yes.The first speaker mentioned about it is hard to take off. Could you comment for this?Even if he is that criminal and he really, really want to escape from the police he may be cut their hand or other [inaudible].[inaudible]?sorry. So the [inaudible] only for that [inaudible] criminal we can ignore the big risk for all citizens. We can have to secure our citizens' safety so that's why their point doesn't stand and not important. So our first point they talked about we have definition, so risk is low. However, as I said in an introduction we cannot say completely it is not risk.

So let's move into the second point. Second point is risk of abuse the individual information. So if we had microchip in our bodies we cannot see the microchips after that. However in the microchips there are many individual information like birth date or address or call number. So because people cannot see micro chip information can be stole easily for example by a cyberattack of other way. So if that used in crime or [inaudible] by fraud it is too big risk for the citizen. So [inaudible] teacher of [inaudible] says we cannot see. However, in our side [inaudible] or passport is we can see. So the people can hear [inaudible] in the wallet or keep passport at house. So we can secure individual information. So it is important to prevent destroying citizens' safety. Government has to secure the citizens' safety. So that's why we oppose this motion. Thank you. [applause]

[inaudible] convenience, efficiency can stand because of health and people. Government only mention usability and convenience. However, we mentioned health. Because of health this convenience can't stand. My [inaudible] this health so we oppose this motion. Uniqueness of microchip key point inside body and invisible. So it's difference between [inaudible] and so on. [inaudible] usability too much is connect to risk because collapsed health could help save life. A [inaudible] usability too much and more and more people get a microchip in their body it may promote health damage. It may promote expose their individual information. First I'll talk about the government first and second points and opposition second point in terms of seriousness. They talked about they can recognize and identify people. However, even if they identify recognize we can these things after they identify recognize is it true that we can save these people. Probability is very low. Also in particular in first argument if government knows this information it is no meaning if the family don't know this information so is no meaning. Also they talked about easy to recognize [inaudible]--[inaudible]?--sorry, take individual information. However, this assumption support our second point because they are effective it means they are risk. Because government mission only idea society we can save we can recognize. However, we can recognize means that it tends to be abused easily. Also if governments want to recognize all citizens and it means all citizens are in danger of using individual information easy-- they can understand. So more serious on target is very big. Next I'll talk about our first argument what we want to say in this debate is that risk of health damage. There are many people and each people have their own body and health. So metal is very dangerous for each people. However, it's too late when we recognize risk of microchip. So government shouldn't promote this microchip. Also as I said before [inaudible] usability too much and more can microchip it means that promote health damage and promote exposed individual information, so we strongly oppose this motion. Thank you.

The uniqueness of the microchip implant is always with the body and we don't drop it or lose it or forget to have it. And this is important and that's why there's no alternative way. And it will reduce the risk. That's why we strongly propose this motion. First let me summarize today's [inaudible].Point of information.Sorry. Today we [inaudible] the point whether which is a more higher possibility to save life? Implant microchip or not implant microchip? On their point they mentioned about they have some health issues and there's possibility [inaudible] who are going to allergic anaphylactic shock. However, as we stated on the definition it is already the health safety it's checked.[inaudible]?Sorry. And there is the-- and in the future the implant will be in the future so the safety will secured and as we stated on the definition a medical chip is in--Point of information. Point of information.--sorry. So it's safety. And there is low possibility than the disaster or a criminal. So on our point they mentioned about the disaster and criminal. The disaster the most important thing is microchip implant is even if they-- they cannot recognize. They can know about their information. And it is safety because the government already check up. So it's safety and when the disaster happen we have more possibility to save people. In addition, I mentioned about the criminal and they mentioned that they might cut the hand. However, if they cut hand the hospital or doctor will recognize. In addition, as first speaker say it is quite hard to take off. So it is not easy to take off. So the [inaudible] does not [inaudible]. So considering the risk of the health and possibility of the life that we can save, our point is stronger. Therefore I propose this motion. Thank you.