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Resolved: That the Japanese government should adopt a social security system that provides a basic income to all Japanese citizens.

日本政府は，日本のすべての市民にベーシック・インカムを給付する社会保障制度を採用すべきである。是か非か

# The Background of This Debate Topic

"Basic income": A social security system which is planned to be introduced in Finland etc. Under the Basic income system (“BI”), the government provides a guaranteed minimum income equally to every citizen. As BI does not need the "means test", it is argued to be more efficient and fairer than the current public security systems: Public (National) Pensions, Public Assistance, Employment Insurance, and the Child Benefit system. It is also argued from the viewpoint of preventing fiscal breakdown or population decrease. Needless to say, there are strong oppositions toward the BI system, such as huge spending or workability, etc.

http://time.com/3938210/dutch-basic-income/

http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/dec/10/finland-universal-basic-income-ubi-social-security

# Basic Definitions of Each Phrase

## 1. “adopt a social security system”

After the introduction of the BI, current social security services that overlaps with the BI should be abolished.

1. Livelihood assistance and other assistances (toward the poor) based on the current Public Assistance system should basically be abolished and integrated in the BI.
2. Unemployment benefits and Child/Family care leave benefits based on the Public Employment Insurance should basically be abolished and integrated in the BI.
3. Basic benefits of the Public Pensions system (such as the National Pension）should basically be abolished and integrated in the BI.
4. The current Child Rearing Allowance system (for the poor) and the Child Benefit system should basically be abolished and integrated in the BI.

## 2. “provides a basic income”

The Affirmative side can define the monthly amount of money that is provided as the Basic Income, in the plan. However, the Affirmative side cannot set this amount significantly lower than the current Livelihood assistance (toward the poor).

If the Affirmative side does not define the amount of BI in the Constructive speech, the following plan should be the assumption of the debate. Plan: The Japanese Government should provide 100,000 yen to all adult citizens and 50,000 yen to all minor citizens under the age of 20, every month.

## 3. “to all Japanese citizens”

The affirmative side can define whether the minors should receive the same amount as the adults, but other restrictions toward the payments should not be argued (such as, BI should not be provided to the rich). The BI provides income basically only to the Japanese nation. Now, exceptionally for humane reasons, some local autonomies provide livelihood assistance to alien denizens living in poverty. Such assistance should be assumed as being continued.

## 4. Financial Revenue

Basically, the current State spending toward the Public (National) Pensions, Public Assistance, Employment Insurance, and the Child Benefit system, which will all be integrated in to the BI, should be considered as the source of revenue for the BI. It should be assumed that the remaining deficit should be covered by increasing the tax rates of the Inheritance tax, the Income tax, and the Consumption tax. The Affirmative side can specify the planned increase rates of these three taxes, in the constructive speech Plan.

## 5. The Negative Side Position

The Negative side will support the current Japanese social security system (as of March 2016).

# ADDITIONAL Definitions (Update: July 13th)

## 1. “adopt a social security system”

### On A) The Public Assistance system

* The current Health Insurance system and the Long-Term Care Insurance (*Kaigo-hoken*) system should be maintained as they are in both the Affirmative and the Negative positions.
* The Medical assistance and the Nursing-care assistance of the current Public Assistance system should be maintained as they are in both the Affirmative and the Negative positions. (Public spending and the “means test” on these types of assistance should remain.) Thus, strictly speaking, the types of assistance in the current Public Assistance system that should be abolished are: Livelihood, Housing, Education, Birth, Occupational, and Funeral.

PS: In general, the increase of public spending on medical fees, aging care fees, and public medical assistance is a serious problem. However, this would instigate a policy debate that is independent from the BI debate. So this should not be included in this year’s BI debate.

### On B) The Public Pensions system

* The current Employees' Pension system (*kousei-nenkin*) and the Mutual Aid Pension system (*kyosai-nenkin*) excluding the part that overlaps the basic benefits of the current Public Pensions system (the National Pension）should be maintained as they are in both the Affirmative and the Negative positions.

## 3. “to all Japanese citizens”

* The BI should be provided only to Japanese citizens living in Japan. Japanese citizens living abroad should not receive the benefits.
* In principle, foreign denizens living in Japan should not receive the BI benefits. Exception to this rule is the foreign denizens living in poverty, as mentioned in the above basic definitions. They will be treated as the same as now and should not be the subject of this debate.
* A person who has “dual citizenship” or has no “family register” should equally receive the BI benefits as long as the person has Japanese citizenship and living in Japan.
* Citizens who are in prison should not receive the BI.

## 4. Financial Revenue

* Benefits of the BI should be taxable for the income tax.
* Current deductions for the income tax that, in terms of purpose, overlap the BI (such as the basic exemption, the exemptions for spouses or dependents) should also be abolished. These to-be-abolished tax deductions are, in effect, tax reductions. So, in other words, the abolition of these will be regarded as part of the revenue for the BI.
* The cost of the BI should come from the National finance. Strictly speaking, when the BI system would be enacted, the local governments will be the actual agents. But for the sake of less complicated debates, it should be simply assumed that the benefits will come directly from the State.
* Currently, one quarter of the revenue for the Public Assistance comes from local government. However, in reality, many of those local governments do not have enough budget, so the State has compensated the amount as tax allocation to the local governments. When the BI system would be adopted, such spending from the local governments or compensations to them should both be appropriately curtailed.
* If the Affirmative side does not specify how they propose to increase the tax rates, the Negative side can present Disadvantages or attacks based on their own estimations on how much burden the BI will be for the National finance.

PS: Tax burden will naturally be one of the major issues in this BI debate. However, to argue, for example, on whether the revenue should come from direct tax or indirect tax maybe just some small technicalities. This focus on technicalities may be a not-so-welcome deviation from the supposed core issues of the BI debate. If in case such deviations are observed frequently in local tournaments during the summer or fall season, definitions to restrict the finance issue may be added in the future.

# 論題の前提

解説 ベーシック・インカム(“BI”と省略)：フィンランド等で導入が検討されている社会保障制度。公的年金，生活保護，失業保険などを統合し，政府が全国民一律に最低所得を支給する制度。支給を一々審査しないため，現行の公的な年金制度，生活保護制度，雇用保険制度，児童手当制度の非効率・不平等を解消できるなどとして日本でも昔から議論されている。ほかにも財政破綻や少子化対策との関連で議論されている。もちろん財源論や実効性についての異論も多い。

# 論題の基本定義

## 1. “adopt a social security system”

BIの導入に伴い，給付の趣旨が重複する制度は廃止する

1. 公的な生活保護制度Public Assistanceに基づく生活扶助livelihood assistanceなどは基本的に廃止し，BIに一元化
2. 公的な雇用保険制度Employment Insuranceは基本的に廃止し，失業給付unemployment benefitsも，育児・介護休業給付金Child/Family care leave benefitsも基本的にBIに一元化
3. 公的年金public pensionsの基礎年金部分（国民年金The National pensionなど）は基本的に廃止し，BIに一元化
4. 児童扶養手当Child Rearing Allowance・児童手当Child benefitは基本的に廃止し，BIに一元化

## 2. “provides a basic income”

BIとして一人毎月いくらの金額を支給するかは，肯定側がプランで定義して良い。ただし，現行の生活保護扶助を大幅に下回るような金額で設定してはならない。

もしBIの金額についての定義を肯定側が立論で行わなかったとしたら，以下のプランでディベートをしていると前提することにする。プラン：日本政府はどの市民にも毎月100,000円，未成年者（20歳未満）には50,000円を支給する。Plan: The Japanese Government should provide 100,000 yen to all adult citizens and 50,000 yen to all minor citizens under the age of 20, every month.

## 3. “to all Japanese citizens”

成年と未成年とを同額にするかは肯定側がプランで指定して良いが，それ以外の支給制限（例，裕福な人には支給しないなど）は設けてはならない。BIは基本的には日本国民だけが給付対象となる。ただし各地の自治体で行われている人道的な見地からの在日外国人住民への生活保護は継続することにする。

## 4. 財源

基本的にBIと統合される生活保護，雇用保険，公的年金，児童手当等への公的支出はBIの財源となるものとする。それ以外の不足部分は，相続税・所得税・消費税の増税で補っていると前提する。その三税をどのような組み合わせで増税するかは，肯定側が立論のプランで指定しても良い。

## 5. 否定側

否定側は，2016年3月現在の日本の社会保障制度を維持することを主張することにする。

# 追加定義 （7月13日　更新）

## “adopt a social security system”

### A) 生活保護制度に関連して

* 健康保険制度，介護保険制度については，肯定も否定も現行制度のまま維持する立場とする。
* 生活保護制度のうち医療扶助・介護扶助についても，肯定も否定も現行制度のまま維持する立場とする（これらの点についての，財政支出と資格審査は残る）。したがって上記の定義A)の廃止対象となる現行の生活保護制度は，細かく言えば生活扶助・教育扶助・住宅扶助・出産扶助・生業扶助・葬祭扶助とする。

付記：一般的に医療費，介護費，生活保護の医療扶助の支出増大は深刻な問題となっている。この問題は，BIとは独立した政策ディベートとして，対象外とする。

### C) 公的年金public pensionsの廃止に関して

* 厚生年金・共済年金のうち基礎年金部分（国民年金The National pensionに該当する部分）以外は，現行通りとする。

## 3. “to all Japanese citizens”

* BIは基本的には国内に在住している日本国民だけを給付対象とし，海外居留日本人は支給対象外とする。
* 原則としては日本に居住している外国人住民はBIの対象とはならない。例外としては上記定義のとおり，外国人住民のうち貧困者については現行通りであり，ディベート対象外。
* いわゆる「二重国籍者」や「無戸籍者」も日本国籍を有し,日本に在住している限り，支給対象となる。
* 受刑中の国民へのBI給付は行わない。

## 4. 財源

* BIの給付金も，所得税の対象となるものとする。
* 現行の所得税の所得控除のうち，BIと趣旨の重複する項目（基礎控除，配偶者控除，扶養控除）は廃止されるものとする。つまりこれらの実質的に減税にあたる項目については，BIの財源と見なしてよい。
* BIについては国家財政からの支出とみなす。厳密に言えば，BI実施については地方自治体が事務を行うであろうが，議論が過度に複雑にならないよう，国家から直接支給されているものと単純にみなすことにする。
* 現行の生活保護制度の財源の四分の一は地方自治体負担となっている。ただし，多くの財源不足の自治体については，この地方負担分についても地方交付金として補填されていた。そうした地方負担や補填もBI 導入にあわせ適宜削減されるものとする。
* 肯定側が増税をどのように行うか指定しない場合，否定側は試算等に基づき，国家財政への負担がどの程度になるかについての予想を下にDAや反論を組み立ててよい。

追記：当然，BIディベートでは税負担の問題は主要な争点になる。しかしその財源が直接税であるべきか間接税であるべきかなどは，細かすぎる手段論に過ぎないともいえる。そうした細部にこだわることは，BIディベートで議論すべきとことがらから，望ましとはいえない逸脱をもたらす懸念もある。夏から秋の大会を見て，こうした逸脱が頻繁におきているようなら，税関系の定義について追加指針もありえる。

実際のディベートに基づいた，フィードバックは非常に役立ちます

Feedbacks based on actual debates are really welcome.

Email to Mr. Miyagawa: miyajun@ha.shotoku.ac.jp

# HOW THIS TOPIC WAS CHOSEN

# 論題選定の経緯

 The HEnDA committee selected four potential topic areas from your suggestions in mid-February, and called for public opinion poll whether you approve each potential topics. The result of the poll was: (Total number of votes N = 51)

(1) Immigration 27 votes

移民

Japan should significantly relax its immigration policies.

(2) Basic income 33 votes

ベーシック・インカム

Resolved: That the Japanese government should radically reform its welfare policy and provide a guaranteed minimum income (basic income) to all Japanese citizens.

NB: Wording of this topic during the poll has been modified already.

(3) Euthanasia 20 votes

安楽死

Resolved: That active euthanasia ("sekkyokuteki anrakushi") should be legalized in Japan.

(4) TPP 23 votes

Resolved: That Japan should withdraw from the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

As the BI topic was the most approved topic of the four, the Committee selected it as the 11th national topic. Thank you all for the wonderful and inspiring suggestions and very useful comments!