ECON 421

Public Debt

Fall 2015

Gov't Debt

- ightharpoonup interest-bearing asset B(t)
- ightharpoonup discount bond with face value B(t)
- ▶ per capita debt is given by $b(t) = B(t)/N_t$
- ightharpoonup real interest r(t) determined in equilibrium
- ▶ HH lends b(t)/(1+r(t)) in t to get b(t) in t+1

Taxes in period t:

- ▶ lump sum
- ightharpoonup $au_1(t)$ on young
- $ightharpoonup au_2(t)$ on old

Gov't policy is given by $(B(t), \tau_1(t), \tau_2(t))$.

Gov't Budget Constraint

Accounting relationship: Expenditure = Revenue

$$B(t-1) = \frac{B(t)}{1+r(t)} + N_t \tau_1(t) + N_{t-1} \tau_2(t)$$

In per capita terms:

$$\frac{1}{n}b(t-1) = \frac{b(t)}{1+r(t)} + \tau_1(t) + \frac{1}{n}\tau_2(t)$$

A gov't policy is **feasible** if

- ▶ it satisfies the budget constraint ...
- ▶ ... and does not "explode".

Savings Function

Generation t's problem when old:

$$c_t(t+1) = y_2 + b(t) - \tau_2(t+1)$$

Generation t's problem when young:

$$\max_{c_t(t), c_t(t+1), b(t)} u(c_t(t), c_t(t+1))$$
subject to
$$c_t(t) + \frac{b(t)}{1 + r(t)} = y_1 - \tau_1(t)$$

$$c_t(t+1) = y_2 + b(t) - \tau_2(t+1)$$

Gov't bond allows the young generation to save.

We assume perfect foresight.

Solution:

$$\frac{u'(c_t(t))}{\beta u'(c_t(t+1))} = 1 + r(t)$$

$$c_t(t) + \frac{c_t(t+1)}{1+r(t)} = y_1 + \frac{1}{1+r(t)}y_2 + \tau_1(t) + \frac{1}{1+r(t)}\tau_2(t+1) \equiv y_\tau$$

Savings function is given by

$$b(t) = s((1 + r(t), y_\tau))$$

What matters is the interest rate and the (expected) NPV of (after-tax) life-time wealth y_{τ} .

Definition of Equilibrium

<u>Definition:</u> A (rational expectations) equilibrium is given by a sequence of allocations $(c_t(t), c_t(t+1), b(t))$ and interest rates r(t) such that for a feasible gov't policy $(B(t), \tau_1(t), \tau_2(t))$

- (i) households maximize their utility taking interest rates and the policy as given
- (ii) markets clear, i.e

$$N_t c_t(t) + N_{t-1} c_{t-1}(t) = N_t y_t(t) + N_{t-1} y_{t-1}(t)$$

 $N_t b(t) = B(t)$

Case 1 – No Debt

Without debt, b(t) = 0 for all t, the gov't budget constraint yields

$$\tau_1(t) + \frac{1}{n}\tau_2(t) = 0$$

The household budget constraints are given by

$$c_t(t) = y_1 - \tau_1(t)$$

$$c_{t-1}(t) = y_2 - \tau_2(t)$$

Adding these constraints we obtain

$$N_t c_t(t) + N_{t-1} c_{t-1}(t) = N_t (y_1 - \tau_1(t)) + N_{t-1} (y_2 - \tau_2(t))$$

$$c_t(t) + \frac{1}{n} c_{t-1}(t) = y_1 + \frac{1}{n} y_2$$

We can achieve any allocation via lump-sum taxes.

Case 2 – Only Debt

Without lump-sum taxes the gov't budget constraint is given by

$$N_{t} \frac{b(t)}{1 + r(t)} = N_{t-1}b(t-1)$$

$$\frac{1}{1 + r(t)}b(t) = \frac{1}{n}b(t-1)$$

In a stationary equilibrium, we have

$$\frac{u'(c_1)}{\beta u'(c_2)} = 1 + r(t)$$

$$c_1 + \frac{1}{1 + r(t)}c_2 = y_1 + \frac{1}{1 + r(t)}y_2$$

$$c_1 + \frac{1}{n}c_2 = y_1 + \frac{1}{n}y_2$$

In equilibrium, 1 + r(t) = n which requires a constant level of debt given by $c_2 = y_2 + b^*$.

Non-stationary Equilibria

We can calculate the equilibrium path in the economy with an iterative method.

Step 1: The initial level of debt b(-1) gives

$$c_{-1}(0) = y_2 + b(-1)$$

Step 2: Market clearing gives $c_0(0)$

$$c_0(0) + \frac{1}{n}c_{-1}(0) = y_1 + \frac{1}{n}y_2$$

Step 3: The household problem now yields two equations in two unknowns $c_0(1)$ and r(0).

▶ Budget constraint when young

$$c_0(1) = y_2 + b(0)$$

= $y_2 + \left(\frac{1+r(0)}{n}\right)b(-1)$

Optimal choice of household is given by

$$\frac{u'(c_0(0))}{\beta u'(c_0(1))} = 1 + r(0)$$

Step 5: Use the gov't budget constraint to calculate b(0)

$$\frac{1}{n}b(-1) = \frac{b(0)}{1+r(0)}$$

Step 6: Iterate over time.

What Levels of Gov't Debt are Feasible?

There are three possible scenarios.

- ▶ For some initial level of debt, $b(-1) = b^*$, interest rates are constant at 1 + r = n and debt is stationary over time.
- ▶ For $b(-1) < b^*$, debt is decreasing over time and so are interest rates.
- ▶ For $b(-1) > b^*$, debt explodes and so do interest rates.

In the last case, there is a corner solution such that $c_t(t) = y_1$ and $c_t(t+1) = y_2$ for all t.

Why? Eventually households would not be willing to hold the total stock of debt and the incentive to buy debt would unravel backwards.