Past, present or future? Deciding who pays for our public goods and services

How we define our needs and fund them reflect our commitment to one another as a nation.
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One of the highlights of Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong’s National Day Rally speech was the announcement of the S$7 billion Majulah Package. It’s aimed at meeting the rising needs of lower-middle-income Singaporeans aged 50 and above this year – described as “young seniors” by PM Lee.

The package, which is divided into three parts, will include a yearly Central Provident Fund (CPF) bonus of up to S$1,000 for individuals who continue to work. Those who have not met the CPF Basic Retirement Sum will receive a one-time CPF bonus of S$500, while those who are 50 and above will get a one-time Medisave Bonus of S$1,000. These in the Pioneer and Merdeka generations will also benefit from the package.

Beyond these details that were unveiled, there was an emphasis that the package will be funded out of the budget of the current term of government. As with the Pioneer and Merdeka Generation packages in the Government’s annual budgets in 2004 and 2009, respectively, the Majulah Package is likely to be funded from an endowment fund set aside in Budget 2020.

“We will honour this commitment to sustain and budworm future generations,” PM Lee said in his speech. Such a policy and the deliberate care in the manner of funding are efforts to sustain our social compact. Since the launch of the Forward Singapore initiative in February 2009 and2022, Singaporeans have been talking about what a refreshed social compact means for us in areas such as the economy, education, health and more.

An important and tangible way in which we can strengthen our social compact is through reforming our fiscal policies – the manner in which each of us contributes in terms of taxes and transfers to pay for our shared needs. How we fund our public services and what we spend on demonstrate our social compact to each other and different generations in Singapore.

In the 1980s, when Singapore was stepping up its pace of growth and then were plans to boost aviation links with the world, we borrowed from international institutions to fund large infrastructure projects like Changi Airport’s Terminals 1 and 2. By the 1990s, when the economy grew rapidly, the Government paid back all its debts and has since relied solely on revenues to fund all spending.

In 2003, the Significant Infrastructure Government Loan Act (Siga) was introduced to allow borrowing to finance major long-term infrastructure. These changes are not merely to meet the nation’s changing needs. Instead, these fiscal rules and decisions reflect the way we see the needs and investments of different generations of Singaporeans.

For example, a strict rule against borrowing in capital today’s needs is a way of protecting the future generations. However, borrowing for infrastructure projects allows the costs of public goods such as MRT lines to spread across future generations who will also benefit from them. While our yearly budgets are considered as a whole, such that no single expenditure item is directly funded from a specific source, the decision on Siga shows that there is a need to reflect and think more specifically about how different needs should be funded.

This is because we express our commitment to each generation of Singaporeans in a very real way by how we fund our needs – through taxes, by borrowing to spread the costs over successive generations of taxpayers, or by drawing on the national reserves.

Raising taxes will tap the pockets of today’s taxpayers. Paying for public goods and services through government borrowing will increase taxes in the future, especially if the debt is used to fund current consumption. The national reserves are there because of the accumulation and investment of previous years’ taxes paid by past generations that were not used.

Which bucket we take the funds from therefore depends on how we prioritise the present or the future, and respect the legacy of the past. The forward Singapore exercise, conversations on our social compact have been rooted in the context of this “time of change”.

These challenges also explain the Budget deficit that might arise in the near future, as pointed out in the Annual Report on Medium-term Fiscal Projections by the Ministry of Finance in February 2022.

As pressures on our resources increase with growing needs, we need a clear consensus on what is fairness in managing them in order for Singapore to continue as a society based on justice and equality.

A way to illustrate this might be to consider how we would put into practice our findings from the forward Singapore discussions. One of the common values that emerged in the workshops held from January to February was the idea of fairness. Small ideas of reciprocity implies that we value how others pay taxes. Even if we find it difficult to make it an obligation to give back, shifting down on a benefit that extends to the whole of the nation, our national reserves can still be accessed if necessary in a situation such as the pandemic that we continue to depend on. What does it mean to give back to the past generations that have built up and passed on this huge benefit to us?

One way of giving back might be to tap these reserves to fund policies that benefit our elderly. Singaporeans who held the funds of the older generation today might contribute to the future by using the partially accumulated reserves.

There can be many ways to interpret and demonstrate what we value as a society. A strong social compact is maintained when we are able to find consensus in these.

SOCIAL COMPACT AND TAXATION

An attempt to understand these differences in expectations and demonstrations was through a “Public Deliberation on Singapore’s Fiscal Policies and National Reserves” workshop that the Institute of Policy Studies organised in March 2023.

In the workshops, the “funding buckets” were suggested for the participants to decide how and why they would tap such resources to fund hypothetical needs. The few buckets were additional cases, national reserves, investment returns from the reserves, and debt. Each of them took the form of “slog” to show what they mean by giving back or promoting fairness.

An interesting observation from the workshops is that participants of more than 90% said taxes were always first considered before reserves or its investment returns. Debt was viewed with great caution as a last resort. To tap national reserves is viewed as a growing sense of prudence – a case for the future – and hence the belief that the current generation should shoulder the financial responsibilities of their needs as fully as possible.

This hierarchical order of funding sources where taxes are “first-in-first-out” resources demonstrates some form of social compact. Both notions of fairness and reciprocity can be seen as participants chose in these additional taxes over bordering future generations with debts, which they themselves were spared from due to the prudence of the previous generation.

This hierarchical order of funding sources where taxes are “first-in-first-out” resources can be seen as participants chose in these additional taxes over bordering future generations with debts, which they themselves were spared from due to the prudence of the previous generation.

Climate-related issues another stress on the Budget
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Raising taxes will top the pockets of today's taxpayers. Paying for public goods and services through government borrowing will increase taxes in the future, especially if the debt is used to fund current consumption.

The national reserves are there because of the accumulation and investment of previous years' taxes paid by past generations that were not used. Which bucket we take the funds from therefore depends on how we prioritize the present or the future, and respect the legacy of the past.

"MUST HAVE" AND "GOOD TO HAVE"

Other than considering who pays and benefits, the way we view our public needs can also differ along the lines of "must have" versus "good to have". The "must have" is directly tied to national imperatives and existential threats, carrying a high level of urgency. However, "good to have" represents desires for non-essential areas of public expenditure.

How we define a "must have" from a "good to have" will depend on how we view the needs of different groups in society. For example, should expenditures such as the Megalah Package be seen as a "must have" that the state ought to undertake to care for our older Singaporeans? Or should it be seen as a "good to have", since most seniors would have savings and can rely on their children to provide for them?

Another enormous stress on our Budget will come from climate-related issues. For some, infrastructure like public transport and water supply are essential needs that require immediate attention. For others, it may be more of a "good to have" as seen with the activities and events that bring people together.

As the future generations mostly benefit from these policies, it is crucial for the government to plan and manage our resources effectively. This includes prioritizing necessary spending to ensure a sustainable future for our children and the next generation.

CONSENSUS WITHIN AND ACROSS GENERATIONS OF SINGAPOREANS

Across generations, socio-economic backgrounds and more, opinions will differ on how our needs should be categorised and funded, as well as how we ought to prioritise the past, present and future. Clear articulation and finding consensus on how we pay for these needs – by raising taxes, borrowing or a drawdown on the national reserves – will determine the compact in our society.

A strong and sustainable social compact is offered not only when there is consensus, but also when parties to the compact bind themselves by laying down their own chips for needs that may not necessarily benefit them individually.

And as recipients of benefits that we might not have paid for ourselves, we also have the responsibility to protect and pass on these shared resources – the national reserves and the public goods that have been accumulated from past investments – to deepen and sustain our social compact over multiple generations.
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