

The regional dimension of taxes and public expenditure in Ireland

Morgenroth, Edgar

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Morgenroth, E. (2010). The regional dimension of taxes and public expenditure in Ireland. *Regional Studies*, 44(6), 777-789. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400802093839>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu>. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more Information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu>. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



THE REGIONAL DIMENSION OF TAXES AND PUBLIC EXPENDITURE IN IRELAND

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Regional Studies</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | CRES-2007-0113.R1 |
| Manuscript Type: | Policy Debates |
| JEL codes: | H72 - State and Local Budget and Expenditures < H7 - State and Local Government Intergovernmental Relations < H - Public Economics, H77 - Intergovernmental Relations Federalism < H7 - State and Local Government Intergovernmental Relations < H - Public Economics, R11 - Regional Economic Activity: Growth, Development, and Changes < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics |
| Keywords: | Regional Disparities, Government Expenditure, Taxes |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

**THE REGIONAL DIMENSION OF TAXES AND
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE IN IRELAND**

EDGAR MORGENROTH

*Economic and Social Research Institute, Whitaker Square, Sir John Rogerson's
Quay, Dublin 2, Ireland.*

Email: edgar.morgenroth@esri.ie

First received: May 2007

Accepted: January 2008

Abstract: In Ireland as in many other countries there has been an ongoing debate on the nature, degree and trends of regional imbalance. However, relatively little is known about the effects of policies at the regional level in Ireland. This paper considers two aspects of public policy namely the fiscal system and public expenditure. In particular regional government accounts are constructed, which identify the level of taxation, subsidisation and public expenditure at the regional level. The analysis of this data confirms that the fiscal system does reduce relative income differences in Ireland. Furthermore there are substantial resource transfers across regions.

JEL Code: H72, H77, R11.

Keywords: Regional Disparities, Government Expenditure, Taxes.

Les impôts et les dépenses publiques en Irlande: le point de vue régional.

Morgenroth

En Irlande, comme dans la plupart des pays, on discute du déséquilibre régional, sa nature, son importance et ses tendances. Cependant, on sait très peu en Irlande des retombées régionales. Cet article considère deux aspects de la politique publique, à savoir le régime fiscal et les dépenses publiques. On construit en particulier des comptes de l'administration régionale qui identifient le niveau des impôts, des subventions et des dépenses publiques au niveau régional. L'analyse des données confirme que le régime fiscal ne réduit pas en Irlande les écarts des revenus relatifs. Qui plus est, il y a d'importants transferts de ressources à travers les régions.

Ecarts régionaux / Dépenses publiques / Impôts

Classement JEL: H72; H77; R11

Die regionale Dimension von Steuern und öffentlichen Ausgaben in Irland

EDGAR Morgenroth

Abstract:

In Irland gibt es wie in vielen anderen Ländern eine anhaltende Debatte über die Art, das Ausmaß und die Entwicklung von regionalen Ungleichgewichten. Über die Auswirkungen der Politiken auf der Regionalebene von Irland ist hingegen relativ wenig bekannt. In diesem Beitrag werden zwei Aspekte der öffentlichen Politik untersucht, nämlich das Fiskalsystem und die öffentlichen Ausgaben. Insbesondere werden regionale Regierungskonten konstruiert, mit denen das Steueraufkommen, die Subventionen und die öffentlichen Ausgaben auf regionaler Ebene identifiziert werden. Die Analyse dieser Daten bestätigt, dass das Fiskalsystem die relativen Einkommensunterschiede in Irland tatsächlich verringert. Darüber hinaus finden zwischen verschiedenen Regionen erhebliche Transfers von Ressourcen statt.

JEL Code: H72, H77, R11.

Keywords:

Regionale Disparitäten
Staatliche Ausgaben
Steuern

La dimensión regional de impuestos y el gasto público en Irlanda

EDGAR Morgenroth

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract:

Al igual que en otros países, en Irlanda ha habido un continuo debate sobre la naturaleza, el grado y las tendencias del desequilibrio regional. Sin embargo, se sabe relativamente poco de los efectos de las políticas a nivel regional en Irlanda. En este artículo considero dos aspectos de la política pública, es decir, el sistema fiscal y los gastos públicos. En particular, se crean cuentas regionales del gobierno que identifican el nivel de tributación, subsidio y gasto público a nivel regional. Al analizar estos datos se confirma que el sistema fiscal reduce las diferencias relativas de ingresos en Irlanda. Además, hay considerables transferencias de recursos entre las regiones.

Keywords:

Disparidades regionales
Gastos público
Impuestos

JEL Code: H72, H77, R11.

Introduction

In Ireland there has been an ongoing debate about regional disparities going back at least to the 1950's with the enactment of the Underdeveloped Areas Act in 1952¹. Despite or perhaps in spite of the recent strong growth performance there is a perception of growing regional disparities. This perception is supported by the data on output measures (see O'Leary, 2001 or Boyle, McCarthy and Walsh, 1999), but it is not supported by population and labour market trends (see Walsh, 2006). The debate about the existence and scale of regional disparities has been accompanied by a debate about appropriate regional policies and the appropriate allocation of resources across the regions, which however, has not been matched by rigorous analysis of existing policies. Exceptions to this are a number of papers on the effect of industrial policies and a recent contribution on the effect of a tax incentive scheme.

Killen and Ruane (1998) found that company and job survival rates in the foreign owned sector are higher overall than in the indigenous sector, and that survival rates are generally higher for foreign companies at the periphery and for indigenous companies at the cores. An econometric study found that 27 per cent of the job generation in the designated (lagging) areas over the relevant period could be explicitly linked to regional industrial policy (Meyler and Strobl, 2000). However, according to Barrios, S., H. Görg and E. Strobl (2006) the policy to disperse industry across all regions, that was pursued in the 1970s was only effective in attracting low-tech firms to the disadvantaged areas. Furthermore, urbanisation economies were a more important locational determinant for high-tech firms than public investives.

In order to increase economic activity and promote growth in the Upper Shannon Region the Irish government introduced a Rural Renewal Tax Scheme that consisted of special tax breaks in respect to construction developments. Keane and Garvey

(2006) showed that while this scheme reduced unemployment, the costs associated with it were too high for the scheme to pass efficiency tests.

Recently the issue of expenditure across regions has become the focus of debate. For example the Dublin Chamber of Commerce called for more investment in the Dublin region arguing that, “as a driver of economic growth, innovation and employment for the whole island, the needs of the Greater Dublin Area must be prioritised” (Dublin Chamber of Commerce, 2007). On the other hand residents of the less developed regions feel that they are not receiving enough attention particularly in relation to public investment. For example Senator Margaret Cox resigned from the largest government party (Fianna Fail) in early April 2007 because “failure of this Government to spend all the money we promised to invest, and to deliver the projects we committed to, is adversely impacting the daily life of people living in the West”².

This latter view is at least partially driven by the experience with the last National Development Plan (NDP) 2000-2006, for which however data was only available for the two NUTS 2 regions. Fitz Gerald, McCarthy, Morgenroth and O’Connell (2003) showed in their Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the 2000-2006 NDP, that for all spending areas the Southern and Eastern Region was to receive a substantially larger allocation of resources than the Border, Midlands and Western (BMW) region, which of course reflects the different relative size of the regions in terms of population. In per capita terms, however, expenditure in the BMW region was planned to exceed that of the Southern and Eastern region, although the relative allocations within Operational Programmes vary in some cases. When it came to the actual progress the *MTE* showed that these differences were magnified in the outturn with expenditure significantly lower in the BMW region.

1
2
3 While this debate has been ongoing, little is known about the extent and effect of
4 the fiscal system and government expenditure on regional disparities. Thus, the
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

While this debate has been ongoing, little is known about the extent and effect of the fiscal system and government expenditure on regional disparities. Thus, the disparities might well be worse if current policies were not in place.

As Bradley and Morgenroth (1999) note, the fact that the regional disparities in income are smaller than those in output may be due to the redistributive effect of the fiscal system. However, they did not carry out any analysis to back up this assertion. Since regional government accounts are not available for Ireland, which contrasts with the situation in many other countries, such an analysis is not straightforward.

Internationally, fiscal transfers and the distribution of government expenditure at the regional level have been a subject to substantial analysis and debate. For example in the case of the UK the Barnett formula, which is used to distribute resources across regions has been subject to substantial criticism (see McLean and McMillan, 2003). MacKay (2001) showed that total government expenditure exceeds what is expected in four regions namely London, South East, Scotland and Northern Ireland. However, Gripaos (2002) argued that some of this is related to defence expenditure, which has been particularly high in Northern Ireland due to the 'Troubles' and show that once one accounts for defence, expenditure is disproportional in London, the South East and the South West. A recent analysis by Gripaos and Bishop (2005) using new UK data analysed public spending at the regional and sub-regional level. This study showed that spending was higher in London, that there is no relationship between the levels of per capita public expenditure and per capita GDP in the UK and that government spending does little to alleviate regional inequalities in the UK. Likewise there has been a debate in Germany (Berthold, Drews and Thode, 2001), Canada (Rodriguez, 2006) and Portugal (Nogueira Ramos, 2000). Gordon et al. (2004)

showed that London makes a substantial net contribution the UK exchequer, implying that revenue collected in London is redistributed to other regions in the UK.

Despite the ongoing debate a robust analysis of these issues has not been possible in Ireland due to the lack of data. It is the purpose of this paper to construct a consistent dataset and analyse this with a view to identifying the level of cross regional transfers. As such it directly addresses some of the topics of the recent debate.

This paper is organised as follows. The next section provides a brief outline of the fiscal relations across counties, regions and central government. This is followed by an analysis of the impact of taxes and transfer on average income in each county. As this only covers a small part of the fiscal system, regional government accounts are constructed using existing data in conjunction with a number of strong assumptions. This data is then used to identify cross regional transfers.

A Brief Guide to the Irish Regions

There are eight NUTS 3 region, and these make up two NUTS 2 regions, namely the Border, Midlands and West region and the Southern and Eastern region. Table 1 illustrates some of the key characteristics in terms of size and economic development for the most recent years for which data is available. Firstly the table shows that the regions differ quite significantly in terms of size their populations and territory. While Dublin contains a population, which is almost five times the size of the population of the Midlands region it covers the smallest territory.

The table also shows the relative position for index of per capita Gross Value Added (GVA), which is expressed as a percentage of the national average. This shows that there is a significant gap (67%) between the region with the highest GVA

(Dublin) and that with the lowest (Midlands). What the table hides is that the dispersion of relative output measures has increased over time and once one amalgamates the Dublin and Mid-East regions which together form a functional region the gap has also increased substantially. As output variables are susceptible to biases due to commuting patterns and transfer pricing by multinational firms, it is also useful to consider an indicator of personal income. Immediately apparent is that gap between the 'richest' and 'poorest' region is substantially smaller at just 23.5%.

Finally, turning to labour market statistics the table shows the low rate of unemployment in Ireland as well as the relatively small regional variation. Furthermore the implied dependency rates of between 1 and 1.28 dependents per worker are also small with a relatively small gap.

{INSERT TABLE 1 HERE}

The Structure of Fiscal Transfers in Ireland

Before we turn to the effect of the fiscal system on regional income differences and the degree of redistribution across regions it is useful to review the nature of local, regional and national government expenditure at the regional level³.

As highlighted in Morgenroth (1999) Ireland has a very centralised government structure. Regional governance is very weak even though two layers of regional government exist, namely the Regional Assemblies (NUTS 2) and the Regional Authorities (NUTS 3). The regional Assemblies are however the managing authorities for the regional operational programmes of the National Development Plan (NDP) which includes the EU structural funds. Apart from this they along with the Regional

1
2
3 Authorities are responsible for the production of regional development plans and the
4
5 promotion of co-ordination among the local authorities and town councils. These have
6
7 a number of functions social housing, water supply, sewerage, refuse, pollution,
8
9 recreation, fire protection, roads (other than national) and planning. These roles
10
11 involve the supply of local public goods such as fire protection, the supply of
12
13 congestable public goods such as roads and the supply club goods such as recreation.
14
15

16
17 This centralised structure also implies that expenditure is highly centralised. Thus
18
19 the regional assemblies (NUTS2) and regional authorities (NUTS3) have no tax-
20
21 raising powers, while local authorities have very limited tax-raising powers. There is
22
23 no system of regional equalisation payments. Instead the Central Government gives
24
25 grants to the local authorities. General taxes and subsidies (with the exception of
26
27 commercial rates and user charges) are uniform throughout the State and thus these
28
29 are not aimed to directly influence regional development.
30
31
32

33
34 The local authorities can raise revenue through commercial property rates.
35
36 Furthermore, they receive all the vehicle registration taxes for vehicles registered in
37
38 their local authority area. These are paid into the so-called General Fund, which is
39
40 topped up by central government. In addition to this the central government gives
41
42 State Grants to local authorities. Figure 1 shows the importance of the different revue
43
44 streams. Most noticeable is the very high importance of grants from central
45
46 government, which on average was 76% of total current revenue. Interestingly this
47
48 share has been increasing over recent years so that the dependence of local authorities
49
50 on central government is increasing. Thus, rather than becoming less dependent on
51
52 central government, through charges for services provided, local authorities are
53
54 actually becoming more dependent on central government. The miscellaneous
55
56 category, which includes receipts from the provision of goods and services, increased
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in importance over the 1980's but has been declining over the 1990's. This might
4
5 suggests that in fact the privatisation of services is reducing the importance of
6
7 independent revenue streams for local authorities. Capital revenue (not shown here) is
8
9 also dominated by transfers from central government, which account for about 65% of
10
11 capital receipts. Overall, just 8.9 percent of revenues to local and central government
12
13 are collected by local authorities, while these are responsible for 40 per cent of total
14
15 expenditure of local and central government.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 {INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE}
23
24
25
26

27 **The impact of taxes and transfers on incomes**

28
29

30 As mentioned above Bradley and Morgenroth (1999) pointed to the fact that the
31
32 functioning of the welfare and tax system through their redistributive functions might
33
34 be responsible for reducing the gap in incomes as compared to the gap between output
35
36 measures across regions. While this requires a substantial amount of analysis, it turns
37
38 out that it is relatively straightforward to identify the impact of transfers and taxes on
39
40 incomes. This comparison is facilitated by the detailed breakdown of sources of
41
42 income and taxes available in the published data available from the Central Statistics
43
44 Office (CSO) as part of the County Incomes and Regional GDP statistical releases.
45
46 This data is available at the county level, which identifies incomes in 27 counties.
47
48 Figure 2 shows the gap between the county with the lowest per capita income and that
49
50 with the highest per capita income using three different measures. These measures are
51
52 income net of subsidies, total income and total income net of taxes (disposable
53
54 income). The figure clearly shows that the gap is significantly lower once subsidies
55
56 and taxes are taken into account proving that the operation of the tax and welfare
57
58
59
60

system in Ireland does indeed reduce differences. Interestingly the gap increased for all measures until 2002 but the increase is particularly marked for income net of subsidies. Again the differences show the effect of the fiscal system in reducing differences.

{INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE}

In addition to the comparison of the level of gap between the counties with the lowest and highest incomes it is also interesting to consider the differences in each income measure for individual counties. Figure 3 provides such a comparison for the five counties with the lowest income and the five counties with the highest income. This graph clearly shows that the impact of the fiscal system improves the relative income of the poorer counties while disimproving the relative position of the richer counties.

{INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE}

Construction of Regional Government Accounts

Of course personal taxes on personal income and personal subsidies are not the only fiscal transfers that take place, since government also provides services and invests in the regions. Consequently it is also useful to consider how wider government expenditure and taxes are distributed across regions. This analysis can however not readily be carried out since data on such flows is not published in a readily usable form, rather the data needs to be assembled into one comparable

source. In particular some published data does not correspond to national accounts totals. For example total tax revenue for the state (local and central government) was €44.3 billion in 2004 while the figures from the regional accounts and county incomes add to only €37.6 billion, a difference of €6.7 billion. Furthermore, the Regional Accounts do not contain information on all major government activities such as public investment and expenditure on health and education. We therefore aim to produce a consistent set of regional government accounts that correspond to the national accounts total for the whole economy.

Given that only certain data series are available at the regional level it is not possible to construct accounts that are as comprehensive as those available at the national level. However, using the data in conjunction with some strong assumptions it is possible to produce regional government accounts that contain the main components. For this purpose it is useful to first split the government accounts into a revenue (largely taxation) and expenditure side.

Within revenue and expenditure we can identify a number of subheadings for which we aim to construct data. For revenue these are taxes, transfers from abroad and other revenues. Taxes are further subdivided into household taxes, product taxes and other taxes. Since these do not add to the total taxes identified a further category of remaining taxes, which is constructed by apportioning the unaccounted remainder of taxes according to the regional shares of recorded taxes. Other revenues, which include investment income, rental income, loan repayments and borrowing and transfers from abroad, are distributed across the regions according to population shares. In total these latter categories of revenue account for about 14% of total revenues and clearly using population shares to attribute these revenues results in more even revenue generation across regions. However, it appears reasonable for

example to attribute the investment income and loan repayments (18% of other revenues), which derives from investment in public corporations and investments by the Central Bank of Ireland on a per capita basis. Likewise borrowing (16% of other revenues) is naturally distributed across the population. Thus, while this might introduce a bias into the analysis it is likely that the bias is negligible.

These calculations yield the following table for 2004 (Table 2) where the first three rows are taken directly from the County Incomes and Regional GDP statistical release and the remaining data at the county level being constructed as outlined. In the table the row totals for total tax revenue, transfers from abroad and other revenues match the corresponding entries in the National Income and Expenditure (NIE) accounts.

{INSERT TABLE 2 HERE}

As with taxes, some published data of transfers at the regional level are available from the County Incomes and Regional GDP, but again they do not add to the total in the NIE tables. In some years this case the total slightly exceeds that from the NIE so instead of adding a small amount is subtracted to align the data with NIE. As before the differences are attributed on the basis of the regional shares of recorded subsidies.

The wage bill, which forms part of expenditure on goods and services, is calculated using the employment numbers from the Quarterly National Household Survey (QNHS) and the average wage (obtained from the ESRI Macroeconomic database⁴). For this calculation the data is disaggregated into health and education and public administration and defence. The wage bill does not cover other current expenditure, which is covered in NIE (e.g. stationery etc.). This is allocated according to the shares of public workers in the regions. Thus the total expenditure on goods and

services is derived. Clearly this approach assumes that the mix of grades within the public service is equal across regions and it assumes that there is only limited commuting across regions, neither of which may hold in practice. However, alternative approaches are not readily available. At least in relation to commuting it is possible to consider the likely impact, and once one amalgamates the Dublin and Mid-East regions between which substantial commuting flows take place, a relatively modest level of commuting across regions is observed. Based on calculation using the 2002 Census of Population Commuting Micro-data, other than the Mid-East for which net commuting outflows account for about 32% of workers and Dublin where the net inflow is about 16% only the Midlands region which has a net outflow of about 10% no other region records substantial cross regional commuting.

This leaves just two items, namely other expenditure, which includes loan repayment and redemption of securities etc. and Gross Physical Capital Formation. Other expenditure is simply allocated to the regions according to population shares, while it is possible to apportion the GPCF more precisely using the data from the Construction Industry Review and Outlook⁵. This is used to derive the shares for each type of investment, which goes to each region and using this, the total GFCF is derived. In many cases the total investments in the NIE are very similar to those in the Construction Industry Review and Outlook so the resulting regional totals should be quite robust.

{INSERT TABLE 3 HERE}

Analysis

Having constructed regional accounts in the manner outlined above it is possible to analyse trends in the various indicators⁶. Firstly we consider the trends in real per

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

capita resource transfers, that is the per capita excess of expenditure over revenue, which is shown in Figure 4. The figure clearly shows that the level of redistribution has increased over time, which implies that the gap between resource inflows and outflows has increased. This suggests that the Irish fiscal system despite not having explicit equalisation rules acts to reduce regional disparities. This is supported by correlation coefficients for the correlation between the implied transfer of resources and real per capita gross value added (GVA) which are negative and range from 0.86 (1996) to 0.99 (2003) and are all statistically significant (see Table 4). Not surprisingly, the table also shows that revenue is highly correlated to GVA. However, while expenditure is also positively correlated with GVA this correlation is smaller than that for revenue, declining over time and not statistically significant for more recent years. Overall these results correspond to those found by Gordon et.al (2004) in that the capital city makes a net contribution to the exchequer, which is redistributed to other regions. Furthermore, the results suggest that the fiscal system does ameliorate regional disparities, which corresponds with that of MacKay (2003) who showed that poorer regions in the UK receive transfers. Overall, Dublin and the South-West region contribute substantially to regional transfers. For example in 2004 just over €2,000 per person were transferred across regions while in the same year the Midlands region received a transfer of just over €3000 per person. In absolute terms the level of transfers is also substantial. In 2004 just over €3 billion were transferred from the ‘net surplus regions’ Dublin, South-West and Mid-West to the other regions⁷. Overall the tax burden (including social contributions) averages at €11,000 per person in 2004 with a high for Dublin with almost €14,000 per person and a low of €8,500 per person in the Midlands.

{INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE}

{INSERT TABLE 4 HERE}

Another interesting fact emerges when one considers the distribution of both total revenue and total expenditure across regions. While there is a transfer of resources largely from Dublin and the South-West to other regions, which implies that these two regions account for a larger per capita revenue, expenditure in these regions is also above average but not to the same degree as revenue. For example over the period 1995 to 2004 Dublin accounted for 28.9% of the population, 35% of revenue and 31.4% of expenditure. The Midlands, which accounted for just 5.7% of the population and 4.6% of revenue accounted for 5.5% of public expenditure. Thus while being redistributive the fiscal system does not appear to unduly disadvantage the better off regions.

Given that the debate has been concentrating on expenditures and particularly investment it is particularly interesting to consider trends in real per capita public investment. As figure 5 clearly shows that in real terms the level of investment has increased substantially in all regions. However, the Dublin region received a disproportionate share of investment with the level of disproportionality increasing over time. It should however, be noted that given the population of Dublin, in per capita terms Dublin is not favoured when it comes to capital expenditure. Indeed no clear pattern of 'excess' per capita capital expenditure can be detected in the data.

{INSERT FIGURE 5 HERE}

It is also possible to conduct some simple policy evaluation using the constructed data. An interesting example is the so-called 'decentralisation' of 10,235 public sector

1
2
3 jobs, which was announced by the Irish Minister of Finance, Charlie McCreevey, as
4
5 part of Budget 2004^{8,9}. It should be noted here that the Irish ‘decentralisation’ does
6
7 not involve the transfer of government functions to the regional or local level, rather it
8
9 refers to the relocation of central government jobs outside of the capital city, Dublin.
10
11 The planned relocation of jobs would, if implemented entirely in 2004, have led to a
12
13 relocation of 32% of public administration and defence jobs that existed in Dublin in
14
15 2004 away from Dublin¹⁰. The scheme to relocate public servants to towns and cities
16
17 outside of Dublin was justified by the government as a measure to help promote more
18
19 balanced regional growth.
20
21
22
23

24
25 It is possible to assess this rationale in terms of the impact on government
26
27 spending using the assumptions outlined above. These calculations show that
28
29 ‘decentralisation’ increases public expenditure in all regions except Dublin, with these
30
31 increases ranging from 1.2% in the West to 3.9% in the Midlands Regions, while
32
33 Dublin would have experienced a decline in public expenditure of 4.9%¹¹.
34
35 Unfortunately, it is not straightforward to identify the impact of ‘decentralisation’ on
36
37 regional taxation as it is difficult to assess the degree of leakage of income out of the
38
39 regions (e.g. through shopping in another region, cross regional commuting etc.) so it
40
41 is not possible to identify the impact of decentralisation on overall public expenditure
42
43 balances. However, as revenue collected directly from the civil and public servants
44
45 will be a fraction of their total income (wage bill) the overall impact is likely to
46
47 further reduce imbalances. Of course the proposed decentralisation scheme was to be
48
49 implemented over a number of years and indeed the pace of implementation has been
50
51 slow so that the overall impact of the scheme to date has been very limited¹².
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusions

This paper attempts to bring some factual basis to the ongoing debate on regional government expenditure. As such it first considers the degree to which taxes and subsidies at the household level reduce the relative differences in average incomes across counties. That analysis confirms that the fiscal system does reduce relative income differences in Ireland. Since household taxes and subsidies are only a small component of the fiscal system and since the bulk of central and local government revenue is collected at the central level the paper also attempts an analysis of a wider set of regional government accounts, which given that such accounts are not readily available, are constructed in a consistent basis. This requires some strong assumptions, and clearly the estimates derived are dependent on the validity of these assumptions.

The data show some interesting results. Dublin and the South-West contribute to a substantial resource transfer to other regions. The level of transfers is found to be highly related to the state of development. In other words the fiscal system works in a progressive manner in relation to regional disparities¹³. Nevertheless the better off regions receive an above average level of expenditure so that the system only partially equalises. This is particularly pronounced in relation to public gross fixed capital formation, where Dublin gets a significantly larger share in per capita terms than other regions. The result that the tax and expenditure system is progressive across regions stands in contrast with the finding that in Ireland this system has only moderate redistributive qualities across individuals (see Nolan and Smeeding, 2005).

The debate about regional expenditure is implicitly a debate about the trade off between equity and efficiency. Thus poorer regions would argue that that they deserve a 'fair share' of the nation's wealth, while richer regions would argue that this wealth

could only be created if there is sufficient investment in their regions. In as much as the analysis presented here can address this debate, the results would suggest that the Irish fiscal system does provide a mechanism to achieve more equity, while at the same time preserving a higher level of expenditure in the wealth generating regions. The finding that the system provides a significant degree of regional equity is largely the result of the centralised nature of revenue collection in conjunction with the aim to provide similar levels of service across the full range of government activities in all regions. In order to achieve a similar level of equity with a less centralised system would require a more sophisticated system of fiscal equalisation payments across regions. Thus, while many have argued that the Irish system is too centralised (see Morgenroth, 2000) this centrality turns out to be an asset in terms of achieving regional equity.

The conclusion that the system is indeed equitable is based on per capita levels of revenue and expenditure rather than an assessment of needs. However, while this issue was raised in the early 1990s (e.g. Ridge, 1992 and Ridge and Smith, 1992) since the year 2000 the level of transfers from Central to Local government through the General Purpose Local Authority Fund, which accounts for approximately 20 per cent of Local Authority revenue, has been allocated according to a needs and resource model which seeks to account for different needs (see INDECON, 2005).

Whether the levels of transfers provide an optimal balance between equity and efficiency cannot be determined with the analysis provided here. However, at least some researchers have commented on an excessive bias towards equity. For example O’Leary (2002) argued that regional equity considerations might undermine efforts to increase productivity growth, which will be the main driver of future prosperity. In this respect it is noteworthy that public investment accounts for a relatively small

percentage of public expenditure and as there is no clear pattern of 'excess' capital expenditure in the less developed regions, it appears that the bulk of the redistribution does not tackle any structural deficiencies in those less developed regions. Given the experience in other less developed regions of Europe such as the Italian Mezzogiorno, which despite being the destination of substantial transfers have not converged, the analysis provided here points in favour of the arguments put forward by O'Leary (2002).

An important point to note is that the analysis could not account for regional price differences, which might well reduce real disparities since the price level in more urbanised regions tends to exceed that of poorer more rural regions. Thus the level of subsidisation may actually be understated. Furthermore, this paper has only considered levels of expenditure and revenues, which may mask differences in the cost of providing public services. For example, the costs of providing utilities such as electricity and telecommunications, which are provided to broadly the same standards throughout the country, is higher in rural areas. Thus, since some services are cheaper to provide in more densely populated areas and may be subject to scale effects the richer more urban areas may require a lower expenditure to provide an equal service. On the other hand more urbanised regions may face higher costs for example in the provision of public housing. Consequently the degree to which differential costs of providing public services across regions affects cross regional redistribution would need to be assessed through further research.

Notes

1. See Bannon and Lombard (1996), Killen, L. and F. Ruane (1998) or Morgenroth (2003, 2008) for a review of the evolution of regional policy in Ireland.

2. See <http://www.margaretc Cox.com/> for more details.
3. This issue has been dealt with in a number of studies such as Foundation for Fiscal Studies, (1990), Advisory Expert Committee, (1991) and INDECON (2005).
4. http://www.esri.ie/irish_economy/databank/
5. The author would like to thank Annette Hughes of DKM Economic Consultants for help with Construction Industry Review and Outlook data.
6. A summary of the major tax and expenditure categories for all regions over the period 1995 to 2004 is provided in Table A1.
7. Since the per capita comparison may mask differences in dependency rates, the implied transfer per worker was also calculated but this yielded the identical pattern to that shown in Figure 4 (correlation coefficient of no less than 0.99).
8. These include jobs in government departments and public agencies.
9. Another important example would be the impact of the EU Structural Funds. However, as Fitz Gerald et al. (2003) note in their Mid-Term Evaluation of the 2000-2006 National Development Plan, financial data on the expenditures under the Structural Funds in Ireland are not published at the NUTS 3 level. Thus, the impact of including balanced regional development as an objective of the National Development Plan cannot be assessed easily.
10. Dublin accounted for about 35% of all public administration and defence jobs in 2004 (31,825).
11. Not all jobs identified for 'decentralisation' had an alternative location identified in the Budget (13%). For the calculations these were allocated across the regions according to their 'decentralisation share'.
12. By the end of June 2007 decentralising organisations had established a presence in over 20 new locations with over 1,000 staff in place.

13. Given the lack of detailed data it is not possible to consider whether the contrasting result compared to the UK is due to discretionary or non-discretionary spending.

References

- ADVISORY EXPERT COMMITTEE (1991) *Local Government Reorganisation and Reform*. Dublin: Stationery Office.
- BANNON M. and LOMBARD M. (1996) "Evolution of Regional Policy in Ireland", in Shannon Development, *Regional Policy: A report by a Regional Policy Advisory Group to Forfas*. Forfas, Dublin.
- BARRIOS S., GÖRG H. and STROBL E. (2006) Multinationals' Location Choice, Agglomeration Economies, and Public Incentives. *International Regional Science Review*, **29**, 81-107.
- BERTHOLD N., DREWS S. and THODE E. (2001) Die föderale Ordnung in Deutschland - Motor oder Bremse des wirtschaftlichen Wachstums? *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftspolitik*, **50**, 113-40.
- BOYLE G., MCCARTHY T. and WALSH J. A. (1999) "Regional Income Differentials and the Issue of Regional Equalisation in Ireland," *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, **28**, 155-199.
- BRADLEY J. and MORGENROTH E. (1999) Celtic Cubs? Regional Manufacturing in Ireland, in DUFFY D., FITZ GERALD J., KEARNEY I. and SMYTH D. (Eds.), *Medium-Term Review 1999-2005*, pp.155-171. Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin.

- Dublin Chamber of Commerce (2007) *Delivery, Delivery, Delivery - Launch of 'Dublin Business Priorities' Press Release*. Dublin Chamber of Commerce, Dublin (<http://www.dubchamber.ie/print.asp?article=741>).
- FITZ GERALD J., MCCARTHY C., MORGENROTH E. and O'CONNELL P. (2003), The Mid-Term Evaluation of the National Development Plan (NDP) and Community Support Framework (CSF) for Ireland, 2000-2006. *Policy Research Series* No. 50, Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin.
- FOUNDATION FOR FISCAL STUDIES (1990). *Financing of Local Government*, Proceeding of the Fifth Annual Conference of the Foundation for Fiscal Studies. Foundation for Fiscal Studies, Dublin.
- GORDON I., STOCKDALE J., TRAVERS T. AND WHITEHEAD C. (2004) London's Place in the UK Economy, 2004. Corporation of London, London.
- GRIPAIO P. (2002) Regional Spending: A Comment on MacKay *Regional Studies*, **36**, 685-689.
- GRIPAIO P. and BISHOP P. (2005) Government Output and Expenditure in UK Regions and Sub-regions: An Analysis of the New Experimental Accounts Data. *Regional Studies*, **39**, 805-813.
- HEALD D. and SHORT J. (2002) The Regional Dimension of Public Expenditure in England. *Regional Studies*, **36**, 743-755.
- INDECON, (2005) Review of Local Government Financing. Dublin, Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government.
- KEANE M. J. and GARVEY E. (2006) Measuring the Employment Effects of the Rural Renewal Tax Scheme, *Regional Studies*, **40**, 359-74.
- KILLEN L. and RUANE F. (1998) The Regional Dimension of Industrial Policy and Performance in the Republic of Ireland, *Trinity Economic Policy Paper* No. 98/3.

- 1
2
3 MACKAY R.R. (2001) Regional Taxing and Spending: The Search for Balance,
4
5 *Regional Studies*, **35**, 563-575.
6
7
8 MACKAY R.R. (2003) Twenty-five Years of Regional Development, *Regional*
9
10 *Studies*, **37**, 303-318.
11
12
13 McLEAN I. and MCMILLAN A. (2003) The Distribution of Public Expenditure
14
15 across the UK Regions. *Fiscal Studies* **24**, 45-71.
16
17
18 MEYLER, A. and STROBL E. (2000) Job Generation and Regional Industrial Policy
19
20 in Ireland, *Economic and Social Review*, **31**, 111-128.
21
22
23 MORGENROTH E. (2000) Regionalisation and the functions of regional and local
24
25 government" in BARRETT A. (ed.) *Budget Perspectives*. Economic and Social
26
27 Research Institute, Dublin
28
29
30 MORGENROTH E. (2003) An Assessment of the National Spatial Strategy, *ESRI*
31
32 *Seminar Paper*, February.
33
34
35 MORGENROTH E. (2008) Economic Integration and Structural Change: The Case of
36
37 Irish Regions, in KRIEGER-BODEN C., MORGENROTH E., and PETRAKOS
38
39 G. (Eds.) *The Impact of European Integration on Regional Structural Change and*
40
41 *Cohesion*. London, Routledge.
42
43
44 NOLAN B. and Smeeding T. (2005) Ireland's Income Distribution in Comparative
45
46 Perspective, *Review of Income Wealth*. 51, 537-559.
47
48
49 O'LEARY E. (1999), "Regional Income Estimates for Ireland, 1995, *Regional*
50
51 *Studies*, **33**, 805-814.
52
53
54 O'LEARY E. (2001), Regional Divergence in the Celtic Tiger: The Policy Dilemma,
55
56 *Irish Banking Review*, Spring, 2-15.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

O’LEARY E. (2002), Sources of Regional Divergence in the Celtic Tiger: Policy Responses. *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, **32**, 1-31.

RAMOS NOGUEIRA P. (2000) The Regional Accounts of the General Government: An Application to Portugal, *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement*, **26**, 231-252.

RIDGE M. (1992). Local Government Finance and Equalisation: The Case of Ireland. *Fiscal Studies*, **13**, 54-73.

RIDGE M. and SMITH S. (1992) *Rate Support Grant Distribution in Ireland*. Dublin, Stationery Office.

RODRIGUEZ G. (2006) The Role of the Interprovincial Transfers in the β -Convergence Process: Further Empirical Evidence for Canada, *Journal of Economic Studies*, **33**, 12-29.

WALSH B. (2006) Labour Market Adjustment in the Irish Regions, 1988-2005, in Barrett (Ed.) *Quarterly Economic Commentary*, Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin.


{INSERT TABLE A1 HERE}

Table 1. Summary Statistics on Key Variables on Regional Development

| | Population | Area (km ²) | Per Capita Gross Value Added (% of National) | Per Capita Income (% of National) | Unemployment Rate | Persons at Work (1000s) |
|------------|------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| | (2006) | | (2004) | (2004) | (2006Q2) | (2006Q2) |
| Border | 468,375 | 1,234.6 | 74.3 | 91.6 | 5.0 | 205.2 |
| Midlands | 251,664 | 662.5 | 66.3 | 91.4 | 4.0 | 115.2 |
| West | 414,277 | 1,428.7 | 74.8 | 93.8 | 4.2 | 195.5 |
| Dublin | 1,187,176 | 92.1 | 133.3 | 113.0 | 4.8 | 595.4 |
| Mid-East | 475,360 | 606.134 | 73.8 | 98.9 | 3.3 | 225.6 |
| Mid-West | 361,028 | 824.9 | 93.2 | 100.5 | 3.9 | 174.2 |
| South-East | 460,838 | 945.2 | 81.6 | 89.5 | 5.0 | 213.6 |
| South-West | 621,130 | 1,224.2 | 122.3 | 97.4 | 3.7 | 292.3 |
| State | 4,239,848 | 7,018.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 2017.0 |


Source: CSO Census of Population, CSO County Incomes and Regional GDP, Quarterly National Household Survey.

Figure 1. Sources of Local Authority Current Revenue (% of Total Current Revenue)




Source: CSO National Income and Expenditure, various issues.

Figure 2. Gap between the 'richest' and 'poorest' counties in different income indicators accounting for fiscal impacts.



Source: Own calculations using CSO County Incomes and Regional GDP various issues.

Figure 3. Relative Index of various income measures for the ‘poorest’ and ‘richest’ 5 counties (State=100%), 2004



Source: Own calculations using CSO County Incomes and Regional GDP various issues.

Table 2. Regional Revenues for 2004 (€ million).

| | Border | Midlands | West | Dublin | Mid-East | Mid-West | South-East | South-West | State |
|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| household taxes | 1,762 | 933 | 1,547 | 5,997 | 1,980 | 1,555 | 1,607 | 2,574 | 17,955 |
| Other taxes | 135 | 57 | 99 | 540 | 89 | 91 | 133 | 218 | 1,362 |
| product taxes | 1,502 | 709 | 1,332 | 6,884 | 1,456 | 1,454 | 1,621 | 3,295 | 18,253 |
| Tax revenue | 3,399 | 1,699 | 2,978 | 13,421 | 3,525 | 3,100 | 3,361 | 6,087 | 37,570 |
| Remaining taxes attributed | 609 | 304 | 534 | 2,404 | 632 | 555 | 602 | 1,091 | 6,731 |
| Total Tax Revenue | 4,008 | 2,003 | 3,512 | 15,825 | 4,157 | 3,655 | 3,963 | 7,178 | 44,301 |
| Transfers from abroad | 73 | 39 | 65 | 188 | 72 | 57 | 72 | 98 | 663 |
| Other revenues | 738 | 390 | 649 | 1,884 | 720 | 569 | 725 | 983 | 6,658 |
| Total revenues | 4,819 | 2,432 | 4,225 | 17,897 | 4,948 | 4,281 | 4,760 | 8,259 | 51,622 |
| Per Capita Revenues (€) | 10,755 | 10,271 | 10,716 | 15,639 | 11,315 | 12,393 | 10,809 | 13,831 | 12,766 |

Source: Own calculations using National Income and Expenditure 2005 and County Income and


Regional GDP 2004.

Table 3. Regional Expenditure for 2004 (€ million).

| | Border | Midlands | West | Dublin | Mid-East | Mid-West | South-East | South-West | State |
|--|--------|----------|--------|--------|----------|----------|------------|------------|--------|
| Social transfers | 1,766 | 870 | 1,533 | 4,634 | 1,398 | 1,390 | 1,733 | 2,285 | 15,609 |
| Other Subsidies | 92 | 39 | 100 | 55 | 29 | 54 | 49 | 76 | 494 |
| Product Subsidies | 174 | 82 | 154 | 796 | 168 | 168 | 187 | 381 | 2,110 |
| Total Subsidies | 2,032 | 991 | 1,787 | 5,485 | 1,595 | 1,612 | 1,969 | 2,742 | 18,213 |
| attribution | 104 | 51 | 91 | 281 | 82 | 83 | 101 | 140 | 932 |
| Total Subsidies | 2,136 | 1,042 | 1,878 | 5,766 | 1,677 | 1,695 | 2,070 | 2,882 | 19,145 |
| wage bill | 1,474 | 862 | 1,354 | 4,395 | 1,550 | 1,038 | 1,286 | 1,940 | 13,900 |
| other exp on goods and services | 829 | 459 | 763 | 2,381 | 830 | 592 | 713 | 1,092 | 7,658 |
| expenditure on goods and services | 2,303 | 1,321 | 2,117 | 6,777 | 2,380 | 1,630 | 2,000 | 3,031 | 21,558 |
| Other Expenditure | 606 | 320 | 533 | 1,547 | 591 | 467 | 595 | 807 | 5,467 |
| Capital Expenditure | | | | | | | | | |
| Roads | 175 | 180 | 155 | 369 | 377 | 140 | 168 | 267 | 1,832 |
| Water & Sewerage | 70 | 27 | 69 | 94 | 52 | 53 | 61 | 65 | 489 |
| Health | 37 | 46 | 34 | 165 | 43 | 25 | 36 | 97 | 482 |
| Social Housing | 100 | 45 | 55 | 374 | 61 | 53 | 81 | 103 | 871 |
| Public Buildings | 11 | 18 | 31 | 100 | 50 | 14 | 9 | 17 | 249 |
| Education | 21 | 12 | 16 | 94 | 18 | 26 | 15 | 60 | 264 |
| Other | 125 | 99 | 108 | 361 | 182 | 94 | 111 | 184 | 1,264 |
| Total GFCF | 539 | 426 | 467 | 1,556 | 784 | 406 | 480 | 794 | 5,451 |
| Total Expenditure | 5,583 | 3,109 | 4,995 | 15,646 | 5,431 | 21,077 | 4,198 | 5,145 | 7,515 |
| Per Capita Expenditure (€) | 12,460 | 13,129 | 12,667 | 13,672 | 12,420 | 12,154 | 11,683 | 12,585 | 12,766 |

Source: Own calculations using National Income and Expenditure 2005, County Income and Regional GDP 2004 and Construction Industry Review and Outlook.

Figure 4. Implied Real per capita Resource Transfers (2004 prices)




Source: Own calculations.

Table 4. Correlation Coefficients for the relationship between per capita real GVA and per capita real revenue, real expenditure and real transfers

| Year | Per-capita revenue | Per- capita expenditure | Per-capita transfers |
|------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1995 | 0.99*** | 0.71** | -0.88*** |
| 1996 | 0.98*** | 0.80** | -0.86*** |
| 1997 | 0.97*** | 0.75** | -0.89*** |
| 1998 | 0.96*** | 0.68* | -0.96*** |
| 1999 | 0.97*** | 0.66* | -0.96*** |
| 2000 | 0.95*** | 0.57 | -0.95*** |
| 2001 | 0.92*** | 0.66* | -0.90*** |
| 2002 | 0.95*** | 0.48 | -0.98*** |
| 2003 | 0.97*** | 0.39 | -0.99*** |
| 2004 | 0.98*** | 0.42 | -0.96*** |

Note: * denotes significance at the 90% confidence level, ** denotes significance at the 95% confidence level and *** denotes significance at the 99% confidence level.

Figure 5. Real per capita Public Gross Fixed Capital Formation, (2004 prices)



Source: Own calculations. The deflator is taken from Construction Industry Review and Outlook

Table A1. Summary Regional Government Accounts (million €)

| 1995 | Border | Midlands | West | Dublin | Mid-East | Mid-West | South-East | South-West | State |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Total Tax Revenue | 1,557 | 714 | 1,244 | 6,158 | 1,578 | 1,425 | 1,551 | 2,597 | 16,824 |
| Transfers from abroad | 112 | 56 | 96 | 288 | 95 | 87 | 108 | 150 | 992 |
| Other revenues | 883 | 442 | 754 | 2,264 | 745 | 684 | 846 | 1,180 | 7,797 |
| Total revenues | 2,552 | 1,213 | 2,093 | 8,710 | 2,418 | 2,195 | 2,505 | 3,927 | 25,614 |
| Total Subsidies | 943 | 437 | 815 | 2,672 | 673 | 738 | 846 | 1,271 | 8,395 |
| Expenditure on goods and services | 910 | 439 | 718 | 2,921 | 844 | 609 | 725 | 1,156 | 8,323 |
| Other Expenditure | 870 | 436 | 742 | 2,230 | 734 | 673 | 834 | 1,162 | 7,681 |
| Total GFCF | 148 | 71 | 120 | 341 | 116 | 88 | 123 | 207 | 1,215 |
| Total Expenditure | 2,870 | 1,383 | 2,396 | 8,163 | 2,367 | 2,109 | 2,527 | 3,797 | 25,614 |
| Balance | -318 | -170 | -302 | 547 | 51 | 86 | -22 | 130 | 0 |
| 1996 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Tax Revenue | 1,760 | 787 | 1,400 | 7,023 | 1,717 | 1,548 | 1,712 | 2,803 | 18,751 |
| Transfers from abroad | 107 | 54 | 92 | 278 | 91 | 83 | 103 | 143 | 952 |
| Other revenues | 1,212 | 612 | 1,049 | 3,149 | 1,034 | 944 | 1,165 | 1,627 | 10,791 |
| Total revenues | 3,079 | 1,453 | 2,541 | 10,450 | 2,842 | 2,575 | 2,980 | 4,573 | 30,494 |
| Total Subsidies | 1,001 | 470 | 864 | 2,922 | 723 | 800 | 907 | 1,347 | 9,034 |
| Expenditure on goods and services | 831 | 473 | 763 | 3,251 | 865 | 631 | 732 | 1,199 | 8,746 |
| Other Expenditure | 1,269 | 640 | 1,098 | 3,298 | 1,083 | 988 | 1,220 | 1,703 | 11,299 |
| Total GFCF | 173 | 91 | 139 | 371 | 134 | 118 | 149 | 238 | 1,413 |
| Total Expenditure | 3,273 | 1,675 | 2,863 | 9,842 | 2,805 | 2,537 | 3,009 | 4,489 | 30,493 |
| Balance | -194 | -222 | -322 | 608 | 37 | 38 | -28 | 85 | 1 |
| 1997 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Tax Revenue | 1,958 | 871 | 1,530 | 8,060 | 2,029 | 1,743 | 1,854 | 3,282 | 21,328 |
| Transfers from abroad | 122 | 62 | 106 | 320 | 108 | 95 | 117 | 164 | 1,093 |
| Other revenues | 1,176 | 601 | 1,020 | 3,089 | 1,040 | 916 | 1,133 | 1,582 | 10,556 |
| Total revenues | 3,256 | 1,534 | 2,656 | 11,469 | 3,177 | 2,753 | 3,104 | 5,027 | 32,977 |
| Total Subsidies | 1,071 | 507 | 991 | 3,082 | 788 | 859 | 968 | 1,485 | 9,751 |
| Expenditure on goods and services | 971 | 533 | 764 | 3,613 | 962 | 662 | 789 | 1,382 | 9,676 |
| Other Expenditure | 1,320 | 675 | 1,145 | 3,469 | 1,168 | 1,028 | 1,272 | 1,776 | 11,854 |
| Total GFCF | 246 | 99 | 157 | 423 | 167 | 162 | 193 | 248 | 1,696 |
| Total Expenditure | 3,609 | 1,814 | 3,058 | 10,587 | 3,085 | 2,711 | 3,222 | 4,892 | 32,977 |
| Balance | -353 | -280 | -402 | 882 | 92 | 42 | -118 | 136 | 0 |
| 1998 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Tax Revenue | 2,195 | 937 | 1,764 | 9,218 | 2,125 | 1,992 | 2,067 | 3,759 | 24,058 |
| Transfers from abroad | 126 | 65 | 109 | 331 | 113 | 99 | 122 | 169 | 1,133 |
| Other revenues | 865 | 445 | 750 | 2,278 | 779 | 678 | 840 | 1,167 | 7,802 |
| Total revenues | 3,186 | 1,446 | 2,623 | 11,827 | 3,017 | 2,769 | 3,029 | 5,095 | 32,993 |
| Total Subsidies | 1,161 | 548 | 1,038 | 3,256 | 846 | 926 | 1,048 | 1,576 | 10,399 |
| Expenditure on goods and services | 1,052 | 544 | 911 | 3,841 | 1,149 | 821 | 957 | 1,366 | 10,640 |
| Other Expenditure | 1,094 | 562 | 948 | 2,882 | 985 | 858 | 1,063 | 1,476 | 9,868 |
| Total GFCF | 313 | 110 | 211 | 556 | 205 | 191 | 207 | 293 | 2,086 |
| Total Expenditure | 3,620 | 1,764 | 3,108 | 10,535 | 3,185 | 2,796 | 3,274 | 4,711 | 32,993 |
| Balance | -434 | -318 | -485 | 1,292 | -167 | -27 | -245 | 384 | 0 |

Table A1. Summary Regional Government Accounts continued

| 1999 | Border | Midlands | West | Dublin | Mid-East | Mid-West | South-East | South-West | State |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Total Tax Revenue | 2,443 | 1,017 | 1,951 | 10,939 | 2,616 | 2,282 | 2,327 | 4,332 | 27,907 |
| Transfers from abroad | 114 | 59 | 98 | 299 | 104 | 90 | 111 | 154 | 1,030 |
| Other revenues | 2,163 | 1,115 | 1,861 | 5,664 | 1,978 | 1,701 | 2,110 | 2,922 | 19,514 |
| Total revenues | 4,721 | 2,191 | 3,910 | 16,902 | 4,699 | 4,072 | 4,548 | 7,409 | 48,451 |
| Total Subsidies | 1,409 | 660 | 1,269 | 3,916 | 1,042 | 1,117 | 1,279 | 1,907 | 12,599 |
| expenditure on goods and services | 1,148 | 601 | 1,064 | 4,189 | 1,307 | 922 | 1,123 | 1,582 | 11,936 |
| Other Expenditure | 2,343 | 1,208 | 2,016 | 6,136 | 2,143 | 1,842 | 2,285 | 3,165 | 21,138 |
| Total GFCF | 401 | 169 | 294 | 715 | 273 | 295 | 270 | 361 | 2,779 |
| Total Expenditure | 5,301 | 2,638 | 4,643 | 14,956 | 4,765 | 4,176 | 4,957 | 7,015 | 48,451 |
| Balance | -580 | -446 | -733 | 1,946 | -66 | -104 | -410 | 393 | 0 |
| 2000 | Border | Midlands | West | Dublin | Mid-East | Mid-West | South-East | South-West | State |
| Total Tax Revenue | 2,721 | 1,238 | 2,431 | 12,246 | 3,079 | 2,655 | 2,784 | 4,964 | 32,119 |
| Transfers from abroad | 77 | 40 | 66 | 200 | 71 | 60 | 75 | 103 | 692 |
| Other revenues | 310 | 160 | 267 | 809 | 287 | 243 | 301 | 416 | 2,793 |
| Total revenues | 3,108 | 1,438 | 2,764 | 13,255 | 3,437 | 2,959 | 3,160 | 5,484 | 35,604 |
| Total Subsidies | 1,339 | 630 | 1,212 | 3,703 | 977 | 1,081 | 1,245 | 1,807 | 11,995 |
| expenditure on goods and services | 1,337 | 748 | 1,229 | 4,725 | 1,502 | 1,072 | 1,241 | 1,772 | 13,626 |
| Other Expenditure | 692 | 356 | 597 | 1,806 | 640 | 543 | 673 | 930 | 6,238 |
| Total GFCF | 472 | 171 | 385 | 1,144 | 382 | 388 | 317 | 486 | 3,745 |
| Total Expenditure | 3,839 | 1,906 | 3,423 | 11,378 | 3,502 | 3,084 | 3,476 | 4,996 | 35,604 |
| Balance | -731 | -468 | -659 | 1,876 | -65 | -125 | -316 | 488 | 0 |
| 2001 | Border | Midlands | West | Dublin | Mid-East | Mid-West | South-East | South-West | State |
| Total Tax Revenue | 2,842 | 1,421 | 2,434 | 12,772 | 3,415 | 2,741 | 2,977 | 5,250 | 33,853 |
| Transfers from abroad | 85 | 44 | 74 | 222 | 80 | 67 | 84 | 115 | 772 |
| Other revenues | 662 | 343 | 574 | 1,726 | 625 | 522 | 649 | 891 | 5,991 |
| Total revenues | 3,589 | 1,808 | 3,082 | 14,720 | 4,120 | 3,331 | 3,710 | 6,256 | 40,616 |
| Total Subsidies | 1,617 | 768 | 1,442 | 4,413 | 1,206 | 1,288 | 1,516 | 2,217 | 14,468 |
| expenditure on goods and services | 1,614 | 849 | 1,439 | 5,328 | 1,731 | 1,275 | 1,528 | 2,137 | 15,900 |
| Other Expenditure | 564 | 292 | 489 | 1,469 | 532 | 445 | 552 | 759 | 5,101 |
| Total GFCF | 533 | 201 | 492 | 1,680 | 552 | 548 | 417 | 724 | 5,147 |
| Total Expenditure | 4,328 | 2,111 | 3,862 | 12,891 | 4,021 | 3,555 | 4,012 | 5,836 | 40,616 |
| Balance | -739 | -302 | -780 | 1,829 | 99 | -224 | -303 | 420 | 0 |
| 2002 | Border | Midlands | West | Dublin | Mid-East | Mid-West | South-East | South-West | State |
| Total Tax Revenue | 3,164 | 1,560 | 2,660 | 13,074 | 3,530 | 2,840 | 3,356 | 6,127 | 36,312 |
| Transfers from abroad | 86 | 45 | 75 | 222 | 82 | 67 | 84 | 115 | 776 |
| Other revenues | 1,920 | 1,000 | 1,688 | 4,984 | 1,831 | 1,507 | 1,880 | 2,576 | 17,386 |
| Total revenues | 5,170 | 2,605 | 4,423 | 18,280 | 5,443 | 4,415 | 5,320 | 8,818 | 54,474 |
| Total Subsidies | 1,806 | 875 | 1,608 | 4,829 | 1,419 | 1,439 | 1,723 | 2,497 | 16,196 |
| expenditure on goods and services | 1,815 | 1,044 | 1,709 | 5,898 | 2,001 | 1,480 | 1,866 | 2,438 | 18,250 |
| Other Expenditure | 1,609 | 838 | 1,415 | 4,178 | 1,535 | 1,263 | 1,576 | 2,159 | 14,574 |
| Total GFCF | 528 | 307 | 499 | 1,716 | 687 | 507 | 445 | 764 | 5,454 |
| Total Expenditure | 5,758 | 3,065 | 5,230 | 16,620 | 5,643 | 4,689 | 5,610 | 7,858 | 54,474 |
| Balance | -588 | -459 | -807 | 1,660 | -200 | -275 | -290 | 959 | -1 |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table A1. Regional Government Accounts (continued)

| 2003 | Border | Midlands | West | Dublin | Mid-East | Mid-West | South-East | South-West | State |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Total Tax Revenue | 3,542 | 1,756 | 2,976 | 14,319 | 3,675 | 3,125 | 3,585 | 6,604 | 39,583 |
| Transfers from abroad | 62 | 33 | 55 | 160 | 60 | 48 | 61 | 83 | 563 |
| Other revenues | 864 | 453 | 764 | 2,232 | 837 | 674 | 850 | 1,158 | 7,831 |
| Total revenues | 4,468 | 2,242 | 3,795 | 16,711 | 4,572 | 3,847 | 4,496 | 7,846 | 47,977 |
| Total Subsidies | 1,987 | 966 | 1,743 | 5,329 | 1,543 | 1,567 | 1,914 | 2,707 | 17,755 |
| Expenditure on goods and services | 2,026 | 1,205 | 1,874 | 6,256 | 2,204 | 1,595 | 1,905 | 2,618 | 19,684 |
| Other Expenditure | 579 | 304 | 512 | 1,496 | 561 | 451 | 569 | 776 | 5,249 |
| Total GFCF | 442 | 330 | 449 | 1,735 | 783 | 398 | 447 | 706 | 5,289 |
| Total Expenditure | 5,034 | 2,804 | 4,577 | 14,816 | 5,091 | 4,012 | 4,836 | 6,807 | 47,977 |
| Balance | -566 | -562 | -782 | 1,895 | -519 | -165 | -341 | 1,039 | 0 |
| 2004 | Border | Midlands | West | Dublin | Mid-East | Mid-West | South-East | South-West | State |
| Total Tax Revenue | 4,008 | 2,003 | 3,512 | 15,825 | 4,157 | 3,655 | 3,963 | 7,178 | 44,301 |
| Transfers from abroad | 73 | 39 | 65 | 188 | 72 | 57 | 72 | 98 | 663 |
| Other revenues | 738 | 390 | 649 | 1,884 | 720 | 569 | 725 | 983 | 6,658 |
| Total revenues | 4,819 | 2,432 | 4,225 | 17,897 | 4,948 | 4,281 | 4,760 | 8,259 | 51,622 |
| Total Subsidies | 2,136 | 1,042 | 1,878 | 5,766 | 1,677 | 1,695 | 2,070 | 2,882 | 19,145 |
| Expenditure on goods and services | 2,303 | 1,321 | 2,117 | 6,777 | 2,380 | 1,630 | 2,000 | 3,031 | 21,558 |
| Other Expenditure | 606 | 320 | 533 | 1,547 | 591 | 467 | 595 | 807 | 5,467 |
| Total GFCF | 539 | 426 | 467 | 1,556 | 784 | 406 | 480 | 794 | 5,451 |
| Total Expenditure | 5,583 | 3,109 | 4,995 | 15,646 | 5,431 | 4,198 | 5,145 | 7,515 | 51,622 |
| Balance | -764 | -677 | -769 | 2,251 | -483 | 83 | -385 | 744 | 0 |