First Things First
Why tax reform must begin with spending restraint

Don McIver
Director of Research, Atlantic Institute for Market Studies

April 2012

Atlantic Institute for Market Studies

The Atlantic Institute for Market Studies (AIMS) is an independent, non-partisan, social and economic policy think tank based in Halifax. The Institute was founded by a group of Atlantic Canadians to broaden the debate about the realistic options available to build our economy.

AIMS was incorporated as a non-profit corporation under Part II of the *Canada Corporations Act* and was granted charitable registration by Revenue Canada as of October 3, 1994; it received US charitable recognition under 501(c)(3) effective the same date.

The Institute's chief objectives include:

a) initiating and conducting research identifying current and emerging economic and public policy issues facing Atlantic Canadians and Canadians more generally, including research into the economic and social characteristics and potentials of Atlantic Canada and its four constituent provinces;
b) investigating and analyzing the full range of options for public and private sector responses to the issues identified and acting as a catalyst for informed debate on those options, with a particular focus on strategies for overcoming Atlantic Canada's economic challenges in terms of regional disparities;
c) communicating the conclusions of its research to a regional and national audience in a clear, non-partisan way; and
d) sponsoring or organizing conferences, meetings, seminars, lectures. training programs, and publications, using all media of communication (including, without restriction, the electronic media) for the purpose of achieving these objectives.

2000 Barrington Street, Suite 1302, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3K1
Telephone: (902) 429-1143; fax: (902) 425-1393
E-mail: aims@AIMS.ca; Web site: www.AIMS.ca

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Why tax reform must begin with spending restraint

DON MCIVER
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, ATLANTIC INSTITUTE FOR MARKET STUDIES
HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA

Atlantic Institute for Market Studies
Halifax, Nova Scotia
April 2012

Published by the Atlantic Institute for Market Studies
2000 Barrington Street, Suite 1302
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3K1

Telephone: (902) 429-1143
Fax: (902) 425-1393
E-mail: aims@aims.ca
Web site: www.aims.ca

CONTENTS

About the Author

Don McIver is a Halifax-based economist. A former Chief Economist with Sun Life Financial, he provided economic and financial projections in support of the company's global investment operations. Don has filled senior research positions with the Conference Board of Canada and the Canadian Bankers Association.

Don has worked closely with Canadian business organizations. He served two terms on the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Toronto Board of Trade as well as chairing and serving on numerous policy committees of the Board. He sat on the Economic Policy Committee of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and provided regular federal budget briefings for the Chamber. He is the former President of both the Toronto and Ottawa chapters of the Canadian Association of Business Economists.

In addition to his Canadian experience, Don has provided development advice to business organizations overseas—serving lengthy stints with Chambers of Commerce in Guyana, South America and in Sri Lanka.

He has published numerous newsletters and articles—including a number published by AIMS, where he served as AIMS' Research Director between 2003 and 2004. Don is the author of END OF THE LINE—a book describing the personalities and circumstances associated with a major train disaster in 1857 in Hamilton, currently in publication.

Executive Summary

Public demonstrations highlighting the evident unevenness in income distributions—symbolized in the "we are the 99 percent" refrain -- have amplified demands for tax reforms that would produce greater equity while ensuring effective and efficient revenue generation. An earlier paper by the author, titled *The 99 Percent Solution*[1], endeavoured to demonstrate that, in contrast to income allocations based on "raw" pre-tax data, the reality is that existing tax and transfer measures produce a far less extreme degree of income dispersal. That paper also argued that the fundamental economic forces that produce uneven incomes are the same that contribute positively to overall growth throughout the world—and are stimulating exceptional advances in regions of the world that have previously been characterized by stagnation and underdevelopment.

The current paper addresses the issue of how the tax system might be restructured to improve efficiency and effectiveness—whether or not simultaneous changes might be incorporated to affect equity outcomes.

The essential starting point in devising an appropriate tax structure should be the identification of the necessary/appropriate level of public spending. In contrast to the normal budgetary process adopted by individuals and corporations—whereby anticipated revenues are first identified and then appropriate spending plans are generated—the government budgetary progression typically starts with a "wish list" of desirable expenditure and then seeks to identify the revenue sources (taxes or borrowing) that can support the spending.

Successful tax reform then must start with a thorough spending review. That may always have been the best course of action, but at a time when economic and demographic realities are constricting programs such as healthcare, education and pensions, it becomes even more essential to know what programs must be maintained and which ones can be cut. The most sustainable way forward is to forego spending on wants until our needs are fully met. Taxing more simply to fund things it is nice to have puts our priority programs, and the people who depend on them, at risk.

Once comprehensive spending reviews are underway, the prospect of devising better tax systems should be undertaken. Key to this reform should be the identification of which desirable economic activities should be encouraged so as to foster continuing growth. The tax rates and structures that minimize barriers to those activities should then be identified and implemented.

The paper discusses tax structures that have been proven to enhance growth and support sustainable program delivery including increased reliance on value-added taxes and/or the adoption of a flat tax regime. The author notes that it is the conditions imposed and exemptions allowed on simplified taxes that quickly undermine their incidence and effectiveness.

A number of recommendations are suggested that can be summarized in three main points:

1. All levels of government should immediately and cooperatively undertake a thorough review of current and prospective expenditures with a view to eliminating excess spending and matching remaining spending to the identified needs of the population demographic.

2. This spending review should seek to ensure that the level of government delivering a service also collects the taxes or fees associated with funding that service.

3. Tax and spending reform should seek to make the tax and spending system as simple as possible, boutique tax credits and special exemptions should be eliminated wherever feasible.

Introduction

Tax policy is concerned with very much more than how to meet the revenue needs of a country. In addition to effectively raising the required funds, governments must ensure they do so in an efficient manner—ensuring that the compliance costs facing the public and the revenue agency don't outweigh the fiscal benefit. They must also devise a system that is "fair"—"fair' respecting whom it taxes and "fair" respecting how it allocates deductions and ultimately "fair" in the manner in which it distributes funds back to the public through transfers.

Devising such a scheme is obviously a tall order. Economists are trained to observe relationships between conflicting outcomes, construct models and calculate "optimal" results. No matter how effective and efficient a tax system one can devise, what constitutes "fairness" is inevitably a personally subjective consideration. Moreover, in most economic relationships spending is determined by how much income you have. In the case of government it often works the other way around—ministries decide what they need/choose to spend on and then employ the coercive powers of government to raise the revenue.

That said—there has to be a better way of running tax policy than we have now!

What should government be spending on?

The first order in devising appropriate tax policy should be determining how much public money should be spent and on what. Individuals and corporations typically consider their probable income (as well as, sometimes, their borrowing capacity) and then decide how they will spend it—on living costs, savings, employee wages, dividends etc. Governments generally budget from a different perspective. They propose and debate their spending choices and then decide how to produce the income necessary to fund those choices—what taxes to levy on what income groups and how much to borrow. True there are iterative processes that may ultimately restrain their spending wish lists, but there is still a fundamental difference between the private and public sectors: only government can unilaterally determine its income and only government can manipulate markets so as to assure its ability to borrow.

That unique circumstance allows government to make spending decisions—not on income considerations, because it can "generate" whatever level of income it chooses—but on the "worthiness" of the expenditure plan.

That power is not limitless, as developments in southern Europe are currently demonstrating. Sooner or later the growth of debt must be curtailed and/or taxes must be raised—or, as the present US debate focuses on, spending programs must be reigned-in.

The Ontario government is facing a severe fiscal crisis that has been exacerbated by recent shifts in the viability of the province's economic base—especially the heavy reliance on manufacturing. Although Ontario's performance has been typified by substantial deficits over the past two decades, with only a few small surplus years, the recent slide has been dramatic and the current debt accumulation has reached $215 billion, representing 35 percent of provincial GDP.

In response, the Ontario government appointed a commission[2] charged with identifying appropriate measures to reduce the growth of public spending to a trajectory that would allow fiscal balance by 2017-18. The commission was explicitly instructed NOT to review new taxes as a means of achieving fiscal balance.

The report emphasizes that Ontario runs one of the lowest cost provincial governments in Canada-and has done so for decades. It also notes that: among bond investors, Ontario is seen as a well-governed province in a well-governed country.

The report concluded that the restraint objectives can be achieved—and most importantly can be achieved while continuing to provide an acceptable level of public service excellence. The recommendations of the report, while specific to Ontario have meaningful relevance for all Canadian governments.

The essential problem facing governments in most mature economies is that there is simply a superabundance of "worthwhile" expenditure programs. Take healthcare, for example. In Canada publicly-funded medicare has been elevated to the status of a "natural right". Currently, when all federal transfers are excluded from the calculation, government health care spending consumes 87.7 percent of all "own source" revenue in Nova Scotia; 74.2 percent in New Brunswick; 65.5% in Prince Edward Island, and 60.3% in Newfoundland & Labrador[3]. Of course, the federal government does indeed provide significant funds to the provinces—in part to defray the costs of healthcare. Even taking these monies into account, Quebec is already spending more than 50 percent of total revenues on healthcare, and most provinces will be in that position in a few years.[4]

In addition to those massive expenditures are all the individual and privately insured expenditures on pharmaceuticals, physiotherapy, chiropractic and naturopathic care. Lest we be tempted to overemphasize the supposedly more egalitarian approach to healthcare in Canada compared to the United States it should be pointed out that even before the most recent revisions to US government health programs, that country was spending more per-capita on public healthcare than Canada.[5]

Often overlooked in the debate over health spending is the reality that offloading responsibility doesn't make the costs more tractable. That applies whether responsibility is devolved up or down from one level of government to another or whether it is passed along to the private sector. The high demand for medical services is a reflection of population aging, increased longevity and expensive medical advances.

When considering the role of government in healthcare provision the essential question is whether it is the most economically effective means of providing it. Few are likely to dispute that access to "reasonable" care should be available to all—without respect to their ability to pay. What is open to debate is what constitutes "reasonable" and just how those "necessary" services can be most efficiently supplied.

This is not the place to attempt resolving the question of what combination of "wellness" initiatives, public-private partnerships, privatization etc. can deliver that needed efficiency. But it is an appropriate place to make the argument that a public/political debate should be engaged to make that determination. This is not a matter of tweaking a few programs—what is required is a fundamental review of incentives and disincentives built into the current system. At the same time the entire shared-cost structure provided for in the Canada Health Act should be revisited.

That may mean spending less, or indeed spending more, but it certainly means spending wisely and in a reasonably sustainable way. It means spending to deliver value to the consumer and not to deliver maximum profit, wages or benefits to the supplier (whether that supplier be public, private, or not-for-profit).

While a persuasive case can be mounted for the establishment of Canada-wide standards, allowances should be made for regional preferences in delivery and funding. A one-size solution that suits a largely urban high-concentration population is likely inappropriate for a remote less-dense setting. Wages and salaries should reflect local living costs. The current system of per-capita federal transfers does not reflect the higher costs experienced in more rapidly aging regions.

The current system whereby the federal government mandates standards and transfers substantial funds discourages regional flexibility.

That same complaint can be levelled against the multiplicity of shared-cost programs that crowd the Canadian political/economic landscape. Such contingent programs encourage government excess. Individual jurisdictions perceive that they receive programs and structures for which they pay only pennies on the dollar. Of course local taxpayers are equally contributors to the host of similar schemes across the country.

The ideal would be for the level of government that spends a dollar—to raise that dollar from their own tax base. Equalization is a Canadian fixture—indeed the principle is now constitutionally entrenched. AIMS authors have, over the years, argued that such transfers have encouraged overspending in recipient provinces while contributing nothing to inter-regional economic convergence. From a practical perspective, such programs now form such a substantial proportion of government revenue in some provinces that an abrupt cessation would not be possible—but that does not preclude taking steps through shifting tax incidence between government levels so as to ensure wherever possible that the government that delivers services, such as healthcare, are perceived as the level that imposes the taxes that fund them. If compensation for uneven fiscal capacity remains a necessity, let it be explicitly remitted without reference to particular services.

While healthcare represents the aging gorilla in the fiscal room, and equalization its overweight cousin, there are other major programs that demand rationalization. There is growing evidence of a pension divide in Canada—wherein the circumstances of retired public servants will contrast markedly with the straightened conditions facing private sector individuals.

The role of government in the provision of education is similarly problematic. In some regions, the school age population is declining while those employed in the sector resist downsizing. Tertiary education is another split funding responsibility. Some argue that investment in education is better rewarded by keeping student costs down. In some countries, the UK for example, tuition fees have been hiked to more closely reflect university costs—with the advantage that students are more likely to appropriately value their course selection, while serving also to temper the wage bargaining power of teachers.

As noted, in the past, government policies have first focussed on identifying desirable outcomes, implementing policies to address them and only then resolving the issue of how to fund them. All of these major expenditure categories can be properly defended as “worthwhile”. The problem, as is becoming increasingly evident in a great many “advanced” economies is that collectively they are not sustainable in their present format.

Funding alternatives have been stretched to the limit—especially in Atlantic Canada. Taxes are already too high to attract and retain businesses and workers. Combined federal and provincial debt levels are inappropriately high and the costs of carrying debt too onerous.

Current service provisions cannot be sustained without increased costs and with more and more of the population retiring from the workforce the capacity to raise funds will be further constrained.

There is a crucial caveat to be added to this observation—even resolving the spending dilemma of one level of government—or even all levels of government—won’t obviate the dampening effect that aging imposes on economic prospects. In the 1990s federal deficits were partially managed by devolving aspects of health and social expenditure onto the provinces. Some provinces responded by off-loading certain responsibilities onto lower level jurisdictions. Some government agencies have resorted to partial cost recovery by increasing user fees from the public.

Even if all governments were to vacate these major spending programs the underlying demand will remain—and it is of a nature that it will be met ahead of any need to invest in future productive capacity. Healthcare is a pure consumption good—its utility evaporates when the patient dies! Yet virtually all Canadians will first and foremost fill their healthcare needs as a priority—whether they are funded by government programs or out of their own pocket—and population aging guarantees that the total proportion of GDP dedicated to healthcare will continue to rise over the immediate future. The only exception to that would be if we can develop alternative, less expensive, means of delivering health outcomes.

The same is true of pensions. Governments may choose to claw-back or downsize pension provisions—but the expectations of those who feel entitled to receive them, either by contribution or taxation history, will be reduced only at the expense of diminished retirement spending.

Governments of all levels should collectively and collaboratively examine and prioritize their roles—i.e. decide what programs are needed, before determining how best to pay for them. With the 2014 review of federal-provincial arrangements just around the corner, now is a good time to start!

Taxation is a taxing problem!

The apparent failings of present tax systems are perhaps exemplified by comments attributed to US financier Warren Buffet. He has observed that his tax rate is lower than that of his secretary—and that he actually favours the imposition of some sort of "minimum tax" on persons like himself.

How can that be—that a multibillionaire pays a lower rate than an average person. The reason is that he has relatively low "earned income" and high levels of dividend and capital gains revenues that are taxed at lower rates. Buffet notes that—even if his marginal rate on earned income under the present structure was raised to 90 percent—he is uncertain that it would significantly affect his actual marginal rate on total income.[6]

It might be tempting to conclude that those preferential income classes are the issue—that they allow the super-rich to shelter vast incomes. To follow that reasoning would be to overlook the cogent motivation behind the original decision to institute such deductions—that they encourage the reinvestment of earnings that have already been taxed at the corporate level. More pointedly, the opportunity to defer tax incidence is an inducement to discourage immediate consumption.

Buffet is a perfect example of the type of individual who enriches the economic society in which he operates. The "Oracle of Omaha" despite being numbered among the world's wealthiest, lives an abstemious lifestyle: residing in the same simple home he has lived in for decades; expressing a preference for Coca-Cola and hamburgers and avoiding extravagance. He nevertheless travels in a corporate jet, is cosseted by staff, and clearly "wants for nothing".

There can be little question that Buffet's investment savvy has served to nurture massive corporate growth and support countless thousands of jobs. When the 81 year old dies he has pledged to distribute 99 percent of his wealth through philanthropic causes in concert with Microsoft founder Bill Gates.

Contrast that, as Buffet does, with the lifestyle of the flamboyant superstar of, say, baseball. The star, with an income of tens or even hundreds of millions of dollars, most likely has expenditures that nearly match that level. He is, in effect, a consumption machine. Buffet concedes that, without being able to offset earned income with the investment deductions such as he himself has available, the superstar most likely pays his "fair" share of taxes. The allowances that enable Buffet to shelter so much of his income are a double-edged implement—they seemingly allow the rich to avoid tax, but they actively encourage wealth and job creation.

Economics 101 teaches that an individual can do one of two things with income—spend it on consumption or save it. It also teaches that Saving is equal to Investment. What you don't spend on food, housing, yachts or fancy jewellery you save—investing in stocks and bonds etc. or by opening a bank account, in which case the financial institution essentially undertakes the investment on behalf of the individual. While such constructions can be horribly simplistic there is a strong dose of observable common sense behind the principle. The more you invest in future production capability the more assured you will be of continued economic growth and simple consumption takes away from investment.

So can we devise a tax system that encourages investment and discourages consumption that works better than the present one?

The answer is amazingly simple and disturbingly complex—economics usually is! The easiest tax to impose is a sales tax that directly targets consumption. Trouble with that is that if government relied on that as a sole source of revenue the rate would have to be so onerous that tax evasion, under-the-counter dealing and smuggling would we worse than it already is. Moreover there would have to be a significant cross-jurisdictional harmonization—if the rate in a neighbouring province was noticeably lower those close to the border would shop on the other side, to the detriment of local retailers (just ask gas retailers in Amherst NS about cross border traffic to New Brunswick).

Unless such a tax was imposed without any exceptions the old complexities that dogged levies like the GST/HST would resurface. Buy a handful of raw sunflower seeds at your supermarket and you are purchasing a foodstuff…buy the salted variety and you are indulging in a taxable snack! Throw in the arguments of adding the sales tax on top of other taxes as we experience (again) at Nova Scotian gas pumps and…well it is disturbingly complex…as promised.

No advanced economy can finance government operations out of sales taxes alone. Income taxes have the innate advantage that they require two relatively arms-length actors that provide some sort of check against evasion. Employers have a vested interest in declaring wages as a deductible expense—employees must file their returns in order to obtain partial refunds of taxes deducted at source.

What can be done to simplify the income tax system—a lot. Several of the republican candidates for the US presidency have espoused a "flat" income tax. The idea is not new. Steve Forbes proposed a flat tax during the previous campaign. Hong Kong has a flat tax—as do a number of Eastern European countries. Christine Elliott, wife of federal Finance Minister Jim Flaherty, included a flat tax in her campaign to lead the provincial Conservative Party in Ontario. Alberta has a flat provincial income tax.

In its pure form the concept is best explained in The Flat Tax by Robert E. Hall and Alvin Rabushka originally published by the Hoover Institute at Stanford University in 1981. An updated version was published in 2007 and is available on-line.[7] An excellent Canadian interpretation of the Hall-Rabushka concept was published several years ago by the Fraser Institute.[8]

Here is how it works: Personal income is composed of wages and pension income. Business income is composed of the proceeds of all sales of goods and services—minus the costs of inputs such as supplies, labour costs (wages) and capital plant & equipment (at full value in the year of purchase). Personal and business incomes are subject to the same "flat" percentage rate.

The purpose of imposing the levy on business is NOT to tax business—but simply to tax owners (persons) at the source of their income. Businesses are NOT allowed to deduct fringe benefits paid to workers. NEITHER can business deduct dividend or interest payments. The consequence of this is that the Hall-Rabushka flat tax is in essence a consumption tax:

> *"…the Hall-Rabushka flat tax is entirely based on the principle of taxing consumption rather than income. That is, the flat tax is based on consumption because all savings and investment activities are exempt from taxation. Individuals and families would only be taxed on the portion of their income they consume or take out of the economy. Money put back into the economy in the form of savings and investments would be exempt from the flat tax. The result is that a Hall-Rabushka flat tax is essentially a consumption tax because it is levied on income that is spent rather than saved."*[9]

A reminder is necessary at this point respecting why market economists seem so apparently focussed on taxing consumption. We are reminded constantly that "consumption" represents two-thirds of the economy and that recovery is jeopardized if consumers remain on the sideline. So why penalize consumption? Consumption is good…in fact it is the force that defines the economy. Taxes are necessary evils. They constrain spending. New plant and equipment is an investment in productive capacity. In effect it represents deferred consumption—enabling even greater consumption in the future. Which spending category might one wish to promote: immediate consumption or greater future consumption capacity? Future capacity supports economic growth. That is why, no matter how unfortunate consumption taxes are, they are preferable to taxes that discourage investment.

The magic of a flat tax goes a little further, however. Not only does it have the advantage of providing an incentive to investment, in its purest form, it is indistinguishable from the world's favourite taxes (if there can be such a thing) the Value Added Tax (VAT). The VAT (upon which Canada's GST/HST is modelled) is generally judged the least distortionary of sales taxes. The intention is to identify each stage in the production of a good or service and tax it at that point. The purpose is to avoid distortionary taxes that might unevenly impact processes that have differing inputs—e.g. a higher manufactured content, higher labour engagement etc. than others. The principle of a VAT is that it taxes (at a flat rate) the value-added at each stage of production—right up to final sale. Like other inputs, at every step in the chain labour costs are deductible—but they, of course, are then taxed as personal income.

So this whole complicated analysis boils down to this: a Hall-Rabushka flat tax represents a means of collecting government revenue in a manner that is least disruptive of investment and economic growth prospects, and accomplishes it in a manner that concentrates the number of collection points so as to minimize opportunities for evasion.

So what are the issues respecting a flat tax—and for that matter why keep qualifying it as the *Hall-Rabushka* flat tax?

As proposed by Hall & Rabushka, the tax is in its purest form. There are no additional deductions—including personal exemptions: everybody pays exactly the same rate. That brings the discussion back to the starting point: is it "fair"? In practice, wherever flat taxes have been applied or proposed a basic personal exemption is available. In Alberta that amounts to almost $17,000 per person plus similar deductions for spouse and dependants along with a host of other credits/deductions.

That reintroduces the bias respecting the splitting of cohabitant incomes and restores a degree of progressivity to the system. The statutory 10 percent rate never quite clicks in and the value of the deduction is proportionately higher for low income earners. In reality, virtually any notionally flat tax regime could be made as progressive as one wishes. To use the extreme—lets say that one imposes a single rate tax at 90 percent of income and then provides a graduated scale of deductions to ensure a specific degree of progressivity that benefits all earning less that say $100,000. Do you still have a flat tax?

Virtually all flat tax proposals envision some deductions—without which they would likely fail the general consensus of what constitutes equity. Apart from destroying the simplicity of the flat tax, the introduction of credits and exemptions means that each tax regime must be individually assessed to consider whether it meets the tests of fairness, investment/saving incentives and revenue adequacy.

One possible strategy is to address the tax efficiency issues directly by imposing a "pure" flat tax and to deal with the fairness issue openly through expenditure. That would entail providing income support to individuals in need and/or providing grants/compensation for worthwhile initiatives. There are two problems with that: firstly, it would reintroduce the sort of bureaucratic complexity of determining entitlement that had just been eliminated from the tax system; secondly, it would undermine the transition from state-dependant to personal independence. The existence of a "welfare trap" has long been recognized. The costs of progressing from support to employment are already hampered by having to give up a range of benefits in exchange for minimum wage employment. That transition would become even more uninviting if one immediately moved to essentially the top marginal tax rate.

How can all these conflicting matters be resolved? The current debate in the United States has pitted the "we can't achieve fiscal stability by taxes alone" against the "not on the backs of necessary spending." The resolution is not simply to seek a middle ground, but to address the fundamentals. In Canada that amounts to the following:

1. What are the essential services Canadians are going to require? That will require a far more comprehensive review of healthcare and pensions than we have so far been willing to undertake.

2. What portion of those do Canadians feel should be provided directly by the state? Answering that question may well reveal a discrepancy. Those in their support-recipient years may have expectations beyond what those in their tax-provider years are prepared to bear.

3. The first corollary to the second question will be the identification of those services Canadians feel should be state-funded but not necessarily state-supplied—i.e. what degree of privatization is appropriate.

4. The second corollary of the second question is what services currently provided are no longer judged to be the essential role of government.

Issues 1 through 4 essentially identify the "necessary" expenditure of government. It may be greater or lesser than it is today—but its composition will necessarily be different.

Nevertheless, **all levels of government should immediately and cooperatively undertake a thorough review of current and prospective expenditures with a view to eliminating excess spending and matching remaining spending to the identified needs of the population demographic.**

The goal should not be to satisfy all special interests, a recipe for never ending spending growth. Instead the focus should be to reduce spending where possible and reallocate spending where appropriate in order to ensure sufficient spending to meet the core responsibilities of government.

Deciding collectively what needs to be spent is only part of the process—what needs to be addressed is who should do the spending.

5. How should the responsibilities of the various levels of government be divided? Are traditional shared-cost programs the best way to meet service requirements or can a better system be devised that makes individual government units more accountable for raising funds they expend? With federal-provincial programs such as equalization scheduled for review over the next couple of years now might be an appropriate juncture to introduce reforms.

This spending review should seek to ensure that the level of government delivering a service also collects the taxes or fees associated with funding that service.

Beneficiaries must recognize and understand how programs are funded, and by whom, to avoid unsustainable service demands.

Once those exercises have been undertaken, the road to fiscal sustainability requires resolving several additional issues:

6. How should the financial burden of providing services be divided across income/wealth classes? That exercise must be undertaken with a view to resolving issues of fundamental equity with the essential constraint that private investment—the goose that lays the golden egg—should be nurtured so as to ensure future prosperity.

7. How can the tax structure be devised to take into account all of the above and still produce as simple, understandable, equitable and efficient means of collecting essential revenues?

Tax and spending reform should seek to make the tax and spending system as simple as possible, boutique tax credits and special exemptions should be eliminated wherever feasible.

Get the spending envelope right—and then devise the tax system so as to generate the necessary funds. Do that in a manner that explicitly and overtly satisfies commonly held principles of equity while assuring that the system impinges least on saving/investment incentives and minimizes opportunities for evasion.

Conclusion

Making it simple isn't—well, "simple"! The evidence in the United States with the failure of the "super committee" to begin grappling with the entrenched polarity of fiscal choice; and the brinksmanship of European governments unwilling to impose essential reforms—suggests that in most countries the political will to engage in the serious debate necessary to identify appropriate spending levels and efficient taxation structures has not yet surfaced.

Canada, with a somewhat less polar political environment and, so far, more resilient economic setting, may be better placed to begin the necessary adult conversations. Will we?

References

[1] Don McIver, *"The 99% Solution";* AIMS February 2012

[2] *"Public Services for Ontarians: A Path to Sustainability and Excellence Commission on the Reform of Ontario's Public Services"*—Don Drummond, Chair February 2012 http://www.fin.gov.on.ca/en/reformcommission/

3 Brett Skinner, Mark Rovere Canada's Medicare Bubble: Is Government Health Spending Sustainable without User-based Funding? Fraser Institute April 2011 http://www.fraserinstitute.org/uploadedFiles/fraser-ca/Content/research-news/research/publications/canadas-medicare-bubble.pdf

[4] Op cit

[5] OECD Health Data 2011http://www.oecd.org/document/16/0,3746,en_2649_33929_2085200_1_1_1_1,00.html

[6] Warren Buffet interview "Squawk Box" CNBC November 14th 20111

[7] http://www.hoover.org/publications/books/8329

8 Alvin Rabushka & Niels Veldhuis A Flat Tax for Canada; Pre-released chapter from The Impact and Cost of Taxation in Canada: The Case for a Flat Tax Reform The Fraser Institute 2008

[9] Rabuska et al op cit

Selected Publications from the AIMS Library

Publications on Public Finances

The 99% Solution by Don McIver

You CAN Get There From Here: How Ottawa can put Atlantic Canada on the road to prosperity by Brian Lee Crowley and Don McIver

A Fork in the Road…On the Road to Growth? by Brian Lee Crowley and Charles Cirtwill

An Economic Future with Fewer Numbers: The population and labour force outlook for the Atlantic region by Frank Denton, Christine Feaver and Byron Spencer

Budget Season by Bill Black

The Developing Workforce Problem: Confronting Canadian labour shortages in the coming decades by Jim McNiven

Sticky Fingers: How governments cling to transfer payments by Don McIver

Chasing the Jobs by Bill Black

Careless Intentions: Regional consequences of national policies by Don McIver

Good for you, if you have a job (and keep it) by Andreas Korfmann

Possible Federal Initiative Without the Price Tag by Stewart Kronberg

Up is Down, Right is Left in Atlantic Canada by Charles Cirtwill

The Real Costs of Public Debt by Ali Nadeem

Other Publications of Interest

A Provincial Lifeline by Dr. Paul W. Bennett

The Muddle of Multiculturalism: A liberal critique by Salim Mansur

Signal Strength: Setting the stage for Canada's wireless industry into the next decade by Ian Munro

See Dick Grow Old, See Jane Retire: Today's childcare policy and its impact on tomorrow's labour shortage by Ian Munro

What You Don't Know Can Hurt You: Where does all the money go? by Barrie B. F. Hebb

The End of That 70's Show: Rethinking Canada's communications regulatory institutions for the twenty-first century by Ian Munro

The Real Costs of Public Debt by Ali Nadeem

Spending on Public Heslth Programs: Yet another national divide? by Livio Di Matteo

Get Understanding by John Risley

Till the End of Time: Just how long should we maintain our MLAs in the style to which they have grown accustomed? by Don McIver

Selling Ourselves on Self-Interest: Will a free trade agreement with Europe help us see the light? by Don McIver

Healthy Conversation by Bill Black

We're Number…34!: How the education establishment embellishes international results and why it matters by Tony Bislimi

AIMS is an independent economic and social policy think tank. To borrow the words of Sir Winston Churchill, we redefine “the possible” by collecting and communicating the most current evidence about what works and does not work in meeting the needs of people. By engaging you, your friends and neighbours in informed discussion about your lives we make it possible for government to do the right thing, instead of trying to do everything.

We take no money from government, but we do have to pay the bills and keep the lights on. To HELP with that, just check three simple boxes below:

STEP ONE:
❑ YES! I want to support AIMS. (An official tax receipt will be provided for your donation.)

STEP TWO:
I want to become:
❑ a THINKER ($100 minimum)
❑ a LEADER ($1000 minimum)
❑ a SHAKER ($5,000 minimum)
❑ a MOVER ($10,000 minimum)

STEP THREE:
❑ Make my donation a SUSTAINING one. (committing to continuing your donation at this level for a minimum of three years)

……………………………………………………………………………………………

Name: ––

Title: –––

Organization:––

Address: –––

Telephone:––––––––––––––––––––––––––– Facsimile: ––––––––––––––––––––––––

E-mail: ––

I am paying by: ❑ VISA ❑ Mastercard ❑ Cheque (enclosed)

Credit card #: ––––––––––––––––––––––––––– Expiry Date:––––––––––––––––––––

Name on Credit card: –––––––––––––––––––––––– Signature:––––––––––––––––––––

Please send or fax this form to 2000 Barrington Street, Suite 1302, Halifax, NS B3J 3K1
Telephone: (902) 429-1143 Facsimile: (902) 425-1393 E-mail: aims@aims.ca
For more information please check our website at **www.aims.ca**

Suite 1302 – Cogswell Tower
2000 Barrington Street
Halifax,. NS B3J 3K1
902-429-1143
www.AIMS.ca