WHAT IS EQUALIZATION?

• A federal program started in 1957 that transfers revenues from “have” to “have-not” provinces.
• “To ensure reasonably comparable levels of public services at reasonably comparable levels of taxation”
• Transfers resources to provinces with below average tax bases.
• Designed to help less well-off provinces fund services, without the need to tax their residents excessively.
• $11.3 billion in 2006-07
Total Equalization Since 1957

About $225 billion since 1957

EQUALIZATION’S HISTORY IN CANADA

• 1957 - Simplicity
  – based on 3 taxes
  – Ontario only “have” province
• 1957-67 - Growing Complexity
• 1982
  – Enshrined in Constitution
  – Shift to five province standard
    • Drop “rich” Alberta from standard
    • Drop “poor” Atlantic provinces
• 1982 – 2006
  – Five Province standard includes Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, B.C.
  – 33 tax bases
• 2006? More . . . ?
EQUALIZATION FORMULA

• Very Complex
• Understood by a few dozen people in Canada
• Evidence that it has dysfunctional impacts – unintended consequences
• Giant welfare trap?

Background

• Nobel prize winning (1986) Economist James Buchanan generally seen as “Father of Equalization”
• 1950 published paper which provided a theoretical argument for equalization – to discourage movement of people to high service areas
• Key points of his argument were ignored
  – Regionally differentiated rates of federal taxation
  – Conditional grants tied to activities which increase productivity and mobility of resources
    • Transport
    • Education
• Predicted that Government to government equalization will expand the size of the public sector in recipient areas (Frontier interview 2001)
The Flypaper Effect:

- “Money “thrown” at a State Government tends to stick, even though the welfare of households would be better served if the money was passed through to them as lower taxes”
- “Heavily subsidized states have high per capita expenditures on state government services”

AIMS Paper (2006) observes:

- “The equalization-receiving provinces have larger than average public service employment, higher than average public sector wages, and higher than average levels of debt. Simply arriving at national average levels of these performance indicators would release two provinces – Manitoba and Québec – entirely from reliance on equalization, and reduce the dependence of the others to a very significant degree. Instead of providing reasonably comparable services at reasonably comparable levels of taxation, the recipients of equalization appear to be providing inflated levels of public service costs.”

- 32 more civil servants per thousand in Mb (AIMS)
KILLING MANITOBA WITH KINDNESS

Politicized, Transfer-Dependent Economy
Entrenched anti-growth “Have Not” Economic Model
Trapped in Slow Growth Purgatory

RELATIVE POPULATION AND GDP DECLINE SINCE 1961

Manitoba’s relative share of Canada’s population has fallen 25.7% since 1961

Manitoba’s relative share of Canada’s GDP has fallen 24.1% since 1961
MANITOBA FLY PAPER IMPACTS

- Bigger government per capita
- Expensive public services
- Higher taxes
- Lower investment
  = Have not province “slow growth” purgatory

HIGHEST HEALTHCARE EXPENDITURES

- 12.0% MORE PER CAPITA IN MB VS CANADA (2004F)
- SAVE $391 MILLION IF SPENT AT CDN AVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manitoba</th>
<th>Saskatchewan</th>
<th>Alberta</th>
<th>Cdn Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>$451</td>
<td>$417</td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$463</td>
<td>$475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$517</td>
<td>$530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$573</td>
<td>$585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$633</td>
<td>$645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$693</td>
<td>$705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$753</td>
<td>$765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$813</td>
<td>$825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$863</td>
<td>$875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$913</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$963</td>
<td>$975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,013</td>
<td>$1,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$1,063</td>
<td>$1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,113</td>
<td>$1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003f</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$1,163</td>
<td>$1,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FLYPAPER EFFECT*
**Manitoba Spends Most Per Capita on Schools**

### Highest Provincial Education Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Public School Spending as % of GDP Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont</td>
<td>19.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDN AVG</td>
<td>21.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>22.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask</td>
<td>22.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td>23.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>24.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>25.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>25.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mb</td>
<td>25.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highest Tax Load

Manitoba: Losing lucrative high income tax base; Top 6% pay 33% of total tax.

#### 2006 Northern Plains Tax Load Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2006 Rates</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Nfld</th>
<th>Sask</th>
<th>Que</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Mt</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>DN</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>Mt</th>
<th>WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Tax</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Income Tax</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Tax</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Sales Tax</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Tax</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Tax</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Insurance</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67.85</td>
<td>56.55</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graph showing Public School Spending as % of GDP Per Capita]
Manitoba has the lowest rate of capital investment per capita in western Canada and the third lowest in the country, after two Maritime provinces.

**BILLION DOLLAR OPPORTUNITY COST**

Imagine “Have-Not” Alberta selling oil for half price

- Tom Adams of Energy Probe in Toronto estimates gap between market and local price at between $840 million and $1.2 billion per year.
- Reasonable estimate = $1 billion
- See [www.fcpp.org](http://www.fcpp.org) for calculation.
EQUALIZATION SUBSIDIZES CHEAP ELECTRICITY

Equalization Subsidizes Cheap Power

Over 60% of equalization pays for below market electricity pricing

OPTIMUM SIZE OF GOVERNMENT NOT ACHIEVABLE

- Optimum Size of Government
  - Research: 20 to 30% of GDP
  - Canada at 40%
  - Manitoba over 50%

Putin’s Former Economic Advisor Andrei Illarionov

“13%”
GOVERNMENT AS % OF GDP
"HAVE NOTS" ALL ABOVE OPTIMUM SIZE OF GOVERNMENT

Tot Govt Spending as % of GDP (2004-05)

ESCAPING THE EQUALIZATION TRAP

3 Strategies for Making Equalization Transformational

1. Simplifying Formula
2. Debt-for Equalization Swap
3. Tax Swap
SIMPLIFYING THE FORMULA

• Remove resource revenues from the formula to greatly simplify the program and ameliorate the welfare trap effect caused by claw backs (see www.aims.ca)
• Make transfers sensitive to the effectiveness of spending in recipient regions, with a simple rule, phased in over five years:
  – Recipient provinces cannot spend more than national per capita averages on public services (flypaper effect)

DEBT-FOR-EQUALIZATION SWAP

• Most equalization goes out the door in the form of provincial debt service charges.
• Debt-for-equalization swap would allow have-nots to clean up balance sheets, swapping the end of debt payments for equalization payments.
• Ottawa’s equalization commitment and the accompanying distortions would be eliminated.
• The price? A manageable increase in a steadily falling federal debt with a further saving due to lower debt servicing costs in Ottawa due to its better credit rating.
• Requires strict rules to prevent provinces from simply running up their debt again.
THE TAX SWAP

- Bundling equalization together with other federal transfer programs, including support for health and other social programs (CHST), the transfer in 2004 is about $33 billion.
- GST revenue during the same period is projected at almost $29 billion, or roughly the same amount.
- Subject to harmonizing the GST with provincial sales taxes, the federal government would simply hand provinces the GST as a substitute for equalization and CHST programs.
- Eliminates the unnecessary bureaucratic and political churn that characterize transfers.
- It would also be the least difficult to sell since all provinces benefit from the swap.

www.fcpp.org