

Handout on taxing savings

E. Saez, "The Desirability of Commodity Taxation Under Non-Linear Income Taxation and Heterogeneous Tastes" *Journal of Public Economics*, 83, 2002, 217-230

Notation

$x_i$  consumption in period 1 of household  $i$

$c_i$  consumption in period 2 of household  $i$

$z_i$  earnings of household  $i$

$n_i$  skill of household  $i$

$\delta_i$  discount factor of household  $i$

$U^i$  utility of household  $i$ —concave

$f_i$  number of workers of type  $i$

$w$  wage per unit of skill, set equal to 1

$R$  1 plus the return to capital

Utility

We assume a simple additive structure:

$$U^i [x, c, z/n_i] = u [x] + \delta_i u [c] - v [z/n_i] \quad (1)$$

Full nonlinear taxation (that is not just repeated annual income taxation):

For notational convenience, assume the real return on capital is zero.

$$\text{Maximize}_{x,c,z} \sum f_i (u [x_i] + \delta_i u [c_i] - v [z_i/n_i])$$

$$\text{subject to: } E + \sum f_i (x_i + R^{-1}c_i - z_i) \leq 0$$

$$u [x_i] + \delta_i u [c_i] - v [z_i/n_i] \geq u [x_j] + \delta_i u [c_j] - v [z_j/n_i]$$

for all i and j

(2)

Assume two types. Assume the only binding moral hazard constraint is type 1 considering imitating type 2.

$$\text{Maximize}_{x,c,z} f_1(u [x_1] + \delta_1 u [c_1] - v [z_1/n_1]) + f_2(u [x_2] + \delta_2 u [c_2] - v [z_2/n_2])$$

$$\text{subject to: } E + \sum f_i (x_i + R^{-1}c_i - z_i) \leq 0$$

$$u [x_1] + \delta_1 u [c_1] - v [z_1/n_1] \geq u [x_2] + \delta_1 u [c_2] - v [z_2/n_1]$$

(3)

FOC:

$$f_1 u' [x_1] - \lambda f_{1\Box+} \mu u' [x_1] = 0 \quad \square \quad (4)$$

$$f_1 \delta_1 u' [c_1] - \lambda f_{1\Box+} R^{-1} \mu \delta_1 u' [c_1] = 0 \quad \square \quad (5)$$

$$-f_1 v' [z_1/n_1] / n_{1\Box+} + \lambda f_{1\Box-} \mu v' [z_1/n_1] / n_{1\Box} = 0 \quad \square \quad (6)$$

$$f_2 u' [x_2] - \lambda f_{2\Box-} \mu u' [x_2] = 0 \quad \square \quad (7)$$

$$f_2 \delta_2 u' [c_2] - \lambda f_{2\Box-} R^{-1} \mu \delta_2 u' [c_2] = 0 \quad \square \quad (8)$$

$$-f_2 v' [z_2/n_2] / n_{2\Box+} + \lambda f_{2\Box+} \mu v' [z_2/n_2] / n_{2\Box} = 0 \quad \square \quad (9)$$

First let us review the familiar result that there is no marginal taxation of earnings at the top of the earnings distribution. From the FOC for first-period earnings and consumption, we have:

$$(f_{1\Box+} \mu) u' [x_1] = \lambda f_{1\Box-} (f_{1\Box+} \mu) v' [z_1/n_1] / n_{1\Box} \quad (10)$$

Similarly, from the FOC for first- and second-period consumption, we have:

$$(f_{1\Box+} \mu) u' [x_1] = \lambda f_{1\Box-} (f_{1\Box+} \mu) \delta_1 R u' [c_1] \quad (11)$$

This implies no taxation of savings for type 1. This is the familiar no-taxation condition at the very top of the earnings distribution.

Now let us turn to type 2. First, the marginal taxation of work:

$$\begin{aligned} (f_2 - \mu) u' [x_2] &= \lambda f_2 - f_2 v' [z_2/n_2] / n_2 - \mu v' [z_2/n_1] / n_1 & (12) \\ &= (f_2 - \mu) v' [z_2/n_2] / n_2 + \mu (v' [z_2/n_2] / n_2 - v' [z_2/n_1] / n_1) \end{aligned}$$

With  $v$  convex and  $n_1 > n_2$ , we have  $v' [z_2/n_2] / n_2 > v' [z_2/n_1] / n_1$ . Thus we have  $u' [x_2] > v' [z_2/n_2] / n_2$ . This implies marginal taxation of earnings for type-2 workers. The intuition is that type-1 workers imitating type-2 workers find it easier to earn than do type-2 workers, so we tax that. It is similar to the analysis of the deviation from the Samuelson rule for public goods.

Turning to savings for type 2:

$$(f_2 - \mu) u' [x_2] = \lambda f_2 - f_2 \delta_2 R u' [c_2] - \mu \delta_1 R u' [c_2] \quad (13)$$

$$= (f_2 - \mu) \delta_2 R u' [c_2] + \mu (\delta_2 - \delta_1) R u' [c_2] \quad (14)$$

The plausible case is that high earners value have a lower discount rate, resulting in a higher multiplicative factor on future consumption: implying  $\delta_2 < \delta_1$ . Therefore (with  $f_2 - \mu > 0$ ) we have  $\square$

$$u' [x_2] \leq \delta_2 R u' [c_2] \quad (15)$$

That is, type-2 would save if that were possible at zero taxation of savings, so there is marginal taxation of savings.  $\square$

If and only if  $\delta_2 = \delta_1$  does this imply no taxation of savings for type 2.  $\square$

Saez considers linear taxation of savings. He concludes that since higher earners have higher savings rates, taxing savings is part of the optimum.  $\square$