Simulating Corporate Income Tax Reform Proposals With a DCGE Model

K. Bhattarai[1], J. Haughton[2], M. Head[3] and D.G. Tuerck[4]

September 2015

Abstract

U.S. opinion leaders and policy makers have turned their focus to the corporate income tax, which is now the highest in the developed world. Using a dynamic computable general equilibrium model (the "NCPA-DCGE Model"), we simulate alternative policies for reducing the U.S. corporate income tax. We find that all hypothesized policies result in significant positive impacts on output, investment, capital formation, employment and household well-being. All of the hypothesized reforms also result in a more streamlined public sector. These results are plausible insofar as the DCGE model from which they were obtained is parameterized by plausible elasticity assumptions and incorporates the adjustments in prices, output, employment and investment that result from changes in tax policy.

Research for this paper was conducted under a grant from the National Center for Policy Analysis, 14180 Dallas Parkway, Suite 350, Dallas, Texas 75254

[1]Keshab Bhatterai. The Business School, University of Hull, Cottingham Road, Hull, HU6 7SH, UK; K.R.Bhattarai@hull.ac.uk, phone: 44-1482463207; fax: 44-1482463484; Web: http://www.hull.ac.uk/php/ecskrb/.

[2]Jonathan Haughton. Department of Economics and Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University, 8 Ashburton Place, Boston, MA 02108; jhaughton@suffolk.edu, phone: 617-573-8750 fax: 617-994-4279; Web: http://web.cas.suffolk.edu/faculty/jhaughton/.

[3] Michael Head, Department of Economics and Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University, 8 Ashburton Place, Boston, MA 02108; mhead@beaconhill.org 617-573-8750 fax: 617-994-4279; Web: www.beaconhill.org.

[4] David G. Tuerck. Department of Economics and Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University, 8 Ashburton Place, Boston, MA 02108; dtuerck@beaconhill.org, phone: 617-573-8263; fax: 617-994-4279; Web: www.beaconhill.org.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

U.S. corporate tax reform has emerged as a dominant issue in the political season now upon American voters. Tax reform proposals have been put forward by President Barack Obama and several candidates for president.[1] The political campaign for president offers an opportunity to revisit the rich academic literature, which seeks to explain the burden corporate taxes places on investment. This paper aims to provide information useful to both the political debate and to the academic literature.

The debate over corporate taxes ties into the broader debate over how best to satisfy the two major goals of sound tax policy: efficiency and equity. The tension between the two objectives is inseparable from policy debates, but there is a growing consensus that the existing U.S. tax system is highly inefficient. Mirrlees et al. (2010), writing about the United Kingdom, speaks of a hopeful consensus among most economists observing that "there are taxes that are fairer, less damaging, and simpler than those that we have now. To implement them will take a government ...willing to put long term strategy ahead of short term tactics." As early as 1985, Hall and Rabushka (2007) in the U.S. expressed the urgency for tax reform, by declaring "it is time for another Declaration of Independence, this time from an unfair, costly, complicated federal income tax. The alternative is a low simple flat tax."

The purpose of this paper is to assess the effects of corporate tax reform on the U.S. economy. This analysis is the first based on the dynamic computable general equilibrium model we are building for the National Center for Policy Analysis – Dynamic Computable General Equilibrium (NCPA-DCGE). The purpose of the NCPA-DCGE Model is to examine U.S. tax policy changes for their effects on major economic indicators, including:

- The level and distribution of household income;
- GDP, capital investment, and private sector employment;
- Government tax revenues, employment and spending; and,
- Short-term and long-term consumer welfare.

[1] For a review of several corporate tax reforms under consideration see James P. Angelini and David G. Tuerck, "The U.S. Corporate Income Tax: A Primer for U.S. Policymakers," The Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University and the National Center for Policy Analysis (July 2015), http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/sp_The%20U.S.%20Corporate%20Income%20Tax.pdf.

Dynamic CGE models are the most appropriate tools for assessing the impacts of taxes. Our earlier study found significant benefits from the implementation of the FairTax in terms growth and redistribution in the US economy (Bhattarai, Haughton and Tuerck, forthcoming 2015). This paper focuses on the impacts of changes in corporate income taxes, and the model uses the micro-consistent data from a Social Accounting Matrix (SAM2015) for benchmarking.

There are three main reasons why we focus on corporate tax reform here. First, as shown in Figure 1.1, the United States has the highest statutory tax rate among OECD countries. In their survey of the literature, Angelini and Tuerck (2015) find U.S. corporate rates to be relatively high and to impose a substantial burden on the U.S. economy. While several other countries, including Japan, Germany and the UK, have reduced corporate taxes substantially, the United States still has a combined federal, state and local corporate tax rate of greater than 39 percent. Overesch and Rincke (2011) provide an analysis of the declining rate of corporate taxes across the OECD economies. Leibrecht and Hochgatterer (2012) and Zellner, Ngoie and Kibambe (2015), attribute these falling rates of corporate taxes in OECD countries to the pace of globalization and tax competition.

Second, the high U.S. corporate tax rate appears to represent an inefficient source of revenue. Despite a lower average tax rate (ATR), the marginal tax rate is quite high in the corporate income in the US. This creates distortions. As shown in Figure 1.2, U.S. corporate tax revenue has represented only two percent of GDP in recent years, and is small in comparison to the average of the OECD economies. The U.S. corporate tax contributed about 10 percent of total tax revenue, compared to 8.5 percent across OECD countries. Finally, and as we show below, the existing corporate tax rate imposes a substantial burden on the U.S. economy.

Third, tax reform is back on the political agenda, and features prominently in the policy platforms of several of the leading candidates for the presidency.



Data Source: OECD, Tax Database (http://www.oecd.org/tax/tax-policy/tax-database.htm).



Data Source: OECD, Tax Database (http://www.oecd.org/tax/tax-policy/tax-database.htm).



Data Source: OECD, Tax Database (https://data.oecd.org/tax/tax-on-corporate-profits.htm#indicator-chart).



Data Source: OECD, Tax Database (http://www.oecd.org/tax/tax-policy/tax-database.htm).

2. The Formal Specification of the DCGE Model of the US Economy

2.1 Main Features of the Model

There is an extensive literature that identifies the excess burden of corporate taxes on investment. Angelini and Tuerck (2015) show how corporate taxation in the U.S. imposes a double tax on investors. But past studies are mostly comparative static, partial equilibrium analyses.

A general equilibrium model is a complete specification of the price system in which quantities and prices are determined by the interaction of the demand and supply of goods and factor markets. Governments influence market outcomes by altering prices by means of taxes and transfers and, in the process, exert significant impacts on investments and the economic growth rate of various sectors of the economy. The NCPA-DCGE model allows for labor-leisure choices, and consumption-saving choices, both in the current period and over time. The household is assumed to adopt an optimization rule, which it revises in response to tax-policy changes.

In the NCPA-DCGE model, the structural features of the U.S. economy are akin to those adopted in Bhattarai, Haughton and Tuerck (2015). The model can be used to compare alternative tax policies to determine which are more efficient in terms of maximizing the welfare of U.S. households, consistent with existing levels of technology, and labor and capital endowments.

Households and producers optimize, given their budget and time constraints. Price adjustments bring about the most efficient economic outcomes. The general equilibrium is achieved when excess demand is zero in each market for each period, representing balance between demand and supply. The existence of the general equilibrium is guaranteed by fixed point theorems, and the model is solved using the dynamic routines in the GAMS/MPSGE software.[2] Given the desirable properties of the Constant Elasticity of Substitution (CES) or

[2] General Algebraic Modeling Systems. http://www.gams.com/ and Mathematical Programming System for General Equilibrium Analysis. http://www.gams.com/solvers/mpsge/.

Cobb-Douglas demand and supply functions, equilibrium is stable and unique, and will determine the evolution of the model economies from 2017 to 2050.

The next sections describe the components of the model in more detail.

2.2 Preferences

Infinitely-lived households maximize the present value of utility, as shown in equation (1), which derives from the consumption of goods and services (C_t^h) and leisure (L_t^h), shown in equation (2). Labor supply, measured as time devoted to work (LS_t^h), equals the time endowment minus leisure for each household *h*, as shown by the identity in equation (3).

The welfare and utility of households in this model is nested in three different levels. A composite consumption good for each household is produced from 27 domestic (C_1, C_2, …, C_{27}) and imported commodities (C_{1m}, C_{2m}, ..., C_{27m}) at the bottom of the nest (see Figure 2.1). The second nest shows how households receive utility U_t^h from consuming goods and services, C_t^h, and leisure, L_t^h, where one can evaluate the trade-off between labor, leisure and consumption simultaneously. A hard-working household will have more labor income to spend on consumption but will be left with less leisure. The ultimate aim of a household is to optimize its lifetime utility, LU^h, from choices made over the periods in the model. All U.S. households are categorized in one of the ten deciles and indexed by $h = 1,2,..,10$ ranked from the lowest to the highest income levels.

In the model, infinitely-lived households allocate lifetime income to maximize lifetime utility, which is defined as:

$$LU^h = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \frac{U_t^{h,1-\sigma_{lu}} - 1}{1-\sigma_{lu}}, \qquad (1)$$

where β is the discount factor and depends on the rate of time preference, LU^h is the lifetime utility of the household *h*, σ_{lu}^h measures the elasticity of intertemporal substitution for household *h*, and U_t^h is its instantaneous utility function:

$$U(C_t^h, L_t^h) = \left(\alpha_c^h C_t^{h\,\frac{\sigma_u^h - 1}{\sigma_u^h}} + (1-\alpha_c^h) L_t^{h\,\frac{\sigma_u^h - 1}{\sigma_u^h}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma_u^h}{\sigma_u^h - 1}} . \quad (2)$$

$$LS_t^h = \overline{L}_t^h - L_t^h . \quad (3)$$

Figure 2.1 Nesting of Utilities



Here C_t^h is composite consumption in period *t*, and L_t^h is leisure in period *t*, α_c^h is the consumption share of household *h*, and σ_c^h and σ_u^h respectively represent elasticities of substitution between goods and services and between consumption and leisure. The larger the value of σ_u^h, the more responsive are consumption and labor supply to changes in commodity prices and wage rates.

The representative household in each income decile faces an intertemporal budget constraint whereby the present value of its consumption and leisure in all periods cannot exceed the present value of infinite lifetime full income (wealth constraint), W^h. In the

existing tax system, households pay commodity taxes (such as sales taxes or VAT) and labor income tax, and receive transfer income on a means-tested basis. Thus

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mu(t)(P_t(1+t^{vc})C_t^h + w_t^h(1-t_l)L_t^h) = W^h \quad (4)$$

where, $\mu(t) = \prod_{s=0}^{t-1} \frac{1}{1+r_s}$ is a discount factor, r_s represents the real interest rate on assets at time *s*, P_t is the price of composite consumption (which is based on goods prices), w_t^h is the wage rate for household *h*, t^{vc} is the sales (or value added) tax on consumption, t_l is labor income taxes, C_t^h is composite consumption, which is composed of sectoral consumption goods and W^h is the lifetime wealth of the household. Sectoral aggregations are of the Cobb-Douglas[3] type, so $P_t = \vartheta \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{i,t}^{\alpha_i}$, and $C_t = \prod_{i=1}^{n} C_{i,t}^{\alpha_i^h}$, where α_i^h gives the share of spending on good *i* by the representative household, $C_{i,t}^h$ is a composite of domestic and foreign sector *j* products that enter in the consumption basket of the household *h*, $p_{i,t}$ the gross-of-tax price, and ϑ is a constant price index in the base year.

Lifetime income in this model includes the value the household's labor endowment and other income under the benchmark economy. Lifetime wealth W^h is defined as:

$$W^h = \frac{J_0^h}{1+r_0} + \frac{J_1^h}{(1+r_0)(1+r_1)} + ... + \frac{J_2^h}{\Pi_s^t(1+r_s)} + ... = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mu(t) J_t^h \quad (5)$$

where J_t^h is the household's full disposable income in period *t*, which includes the value of labor endowments and capital income plus transfers. It can be stated as:

$$J_t^h = (1-t_l^h) w_t^h \overline{L}_t^h + (1-t_{i,k}) r_{i,t} K_{i,t}^h + TR_t^h . \quad (6)$$

where w_t^h is the wage rate for household *h*, $\overline{L}_{i,t}^h$ is its labor endowment, $r_{i,t}$ is the rental rate of capital, $K_{i,t}^h$ is the capital stock of type *i* owned by household *h*, TR_t^h is the transfer from the federal or the local government to the household *h*, t_l^h is the tax rate in labor income paid by household *h*, and $t_{i,k}$ is the corporate tax rate in the use of capital inputs.

[3] CES aggregation, where the elasticity of substitution can take different values than 1, is also considered in the model simulations.

We combine equations (1) to (6) to form the Lagrangian for the consumer's intertemporal allocation problem in (7):

$$\Im^h = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{1+\rho}\right)^t \frac{\left(\left(\alpha_c^h C_t^{h\,\frac{\sigma_u^h-1}{\sigma_u^h}} + (1-\alpha_c^h)L_t^{h,\,\frac{\sigma_u^h-1}{\sigma_u^h}}\right)^{\frac{\sigma_u^h}{\sigma_u^h-1}}\right)^{1-\sigma_u^h} - 1}{1-\sigma_u^h} + \lambda^h\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty}\mu(t)\left(P_t(1+t^{vc})C,_t^h + w_t^h(1-t_l)L_t^h + rk_t^h(1-t_k)K_t^h\right) - W^h\right] \cdot$$

(7)

Here, σ_u^h is the intratemporal elasticity of substitution between consumption and leisure, α_c^h is the consumption share of household *h*, λ^h is the shadow price of income in terms of the present value of utility, and β is replaced by $\frac{1}{1+\rho}$, where $\rho > 0$ is the rate of time preference, which indicates the degree to which the household prefers leisure and consumption in earlier rather than in later years.

2.3 Production Function

In each period, the supply process in this economy can be explained by nested production functions for each of 27 sectors. Producers use intermediate inputs in fixed proportions (a "Leontief" technology), but there is flexibility in the use of capital and labor. The nested production structure in Figure 2.2 includes a composite labor supply function from ten categories of households; a sector-specific capital accumulation and capital allocation function; a value-added function; a Leontief function between value added and intermediate inputs; a constant elasticity of transformation (CET) export function between U.S. markets and the rest of the world; a constant elasticity of substitution (CES) function between domestically supplied goods and imports; and a measure of total absorption in the economy.

Figure 2.2. Nested Structure of Production and Trade in the Tax Model for Sector *i*



The objective of a firm in the *j*th sector of the economy is to maximise the present value of profits subject to production technology constraints. Sectoral profits are given by the differences between the revenue from sales and the cost of supply. The unit revenue function is a Constant Elasticity Transformation (CET) composite of the unit price of domestic sales and the unit price of exports. The unit costs are divided between value-added (i.e. payments to labor and capital), and domestic and imported intermediate inputs in the benchmark economy, given by

$$\Pi^{y}_{j,t} = [((1-\delta^{e}_{j})PD^{\frac{\sigma_y-1}{\sigma_y}}_{j,t} + \delta^{e}_{j}PE^{\frac{\sigma_y-1}{\sigma_y}}_{j,t})]^{\frac{1}{\sigma_y-1}} - \theta^{v}_{j}PY^{v}_{j,t} - \theta^{d}_{j}\sum_{i} a^{d}_{i,j}P_{i,t} - \theta^{m}_{j}\sum_{i} a^{m}_{i,j}PM_{j,t}, \quad (8)$$

where $\Pi^{y}_{j,t}$ is the unit profit of activity in sector *j;* $PE_{j,t}$ is the export price of good *j;* $PD_{j,t}$ is the domestic price of good *j;* $PY^{v}_{j,t}$ is the price of value added per unit of output in activity *j;* σ_y is a transformation elasticity parameter; $PM_{j,t}$ import price of intermediate

input; $P_{i,t}$ is the price of final goods used as intermediate goods; δ_j^e is the share parameter for exports in total production; θ_j^v is the share of costs paid to labor and capital; θ_j^d is the cost share of domestic intermediate inputs; θ_j^m is the cost share of imported intermediate inputs; the $a_{i,j}^d$ are input-output coefficients for domestic supply of intermediate goods; and the $a_{i,j}^m$ are input-output coefficients for imported supply of intermediate goods.

Producers maximize the net of tax profit ($\Pi F_{j,t}^y$) as:

$$\Pi F_{j,t}^y = (1-t_i)\left\{[((1-\delta_j^e)PD_{j,t}^{\frac{\sigma_y-1}{\sigma_y}} + \delta_j^e PE_{j,t}^{\frac{\sigma_y-1}{\sigma_y}})]^{\frac{1}{\sigma_y-1}} - \theta_j^v PY_{j,t}^v - \theta_j^d \sum_i a_{i,j}^d P_{i,t} - \theta_j^m \sum_i a_{i,j}^m PM_{j,t}\right\} \quad (9)$$

The government takes a part of pre-tax profit as its revenue from taxes on profits (R_F) as:

$$R_F = t_i \Pi_{j,t}^y = t_i\left\{[((1-\delta_j^e)PD_{j,t}^{\frac{\sigma_y-1}{\sigma_y}} + \delta_j^e PE_{j,t}^{\frac{\sigma_y-1}{\sigma_y}})]^{\frac{1}{\sigma_y-1}} - \theta_j^v PY_{j,t}^v - \theta_j^d \sum_i a_{i,j}^d P_{i,t} - \theta_j^m \sum_i a_{i,j}^m PM_{j,t}\right\} \quad (10)$$

At the bottom of the nest of the production side of the economy, producers use labor and capital in each of *N* sectors to produce value added. The amount of each type of these inputs employed by a producer in a particular sector is based upon the sector-specific production technology and input prices. We use a CES function to express this relationship:

$$Y_{i,t} = \Omega_i\left((1-\delta_i)(K_{i,t})^{\sigma_v} + \delta_i(LS_{i,t})^{\sigma_v}\right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_v}}, \quad (11)$$

where $Y_{i,t}$ is the gross value added of sector i, Ω_i is a shift or scale parameter in the production function, $K_{i,t}$ and $LS_{i,t}$ are the amounts of capital and labor used in sector *i*, δ_i is the share parameter of labor in production, and σ_v is the CES substitution elasticity parameter. This is a constant-returns-to-scale production function. Euler's product exhaustion theorem implies that total output (value added) equals payments to labor and capital, and each factor receives remuneration at the rate of its marginal productivity:

$$PY_{i,t}Y_{i,t} = w_t LS_{i,t} + rk_{i,t}K_{i,t} \quad (12)$$

where w_t is the gross-of-tax composite wage rate that the employer pays to use labor input, and $rk_{i,t}$ is the gross rental rate of capital. Note that the w_t is a composite of wage rates for each category of household, w_t^h; similarly, $LS_{i,t}$ is the composite of $LS_{i,t}^h$, the labor supplied by households, for *h* =1, 2,…, 10.

Then the second nest in production is given by the relationship between the intermediate inputs and gross output as expressed by input-output coefficients, which form a fixed physical non-price based constraint on the production system. The general form of the production function is

$$GY_{i,t} = \min\left(Y_{i,t}, \left(\frac{DI_{i,j,t}}{a_{i,j}^d}\right)_{i=j}, \left(\frac{MI_{i,j,t}}{a_{i,j}^m}\right)_{i=j}\right) \tag{13}$$

where the $a_{i,j}^d$ are input-output coefficients for domestic supply of intermediate goods; $a_{i,j}^m$ are input-output coefficients for imported supply of intermediate goods, $DI_{i,j,t}$ is the supply of domestic intermediate input and $MI_{i,j,t}$ is the supply of imported intermediate inputs. The presence of input-output linkages in the model enables us to assess various kinds of backward and forward impacts of policy changes. For instance, a tax on agricultural output has a direct effect on demands for agricultural goods, and a backward impact that spreads to other sectors that provide inputs to that sector. Similarly, through forward linkages, the tax affects the cost of agricultural inputs to other sectors. For this NCPA-DCGE model these domestic input-output coefficients are obtained from the 27 sector input-output table contained in the Social Accounting Matrix.

2.4 Labor Supply and Capital Accumulation

The underlying growth rate in the DCGE model is determined by the growth rate of labor and capital. The labor supply, LS_t^h for each household *h* is given by the difference between the household labor endowment, $\overline{L}_t^h$, and the demand for leisure, L_t^h.

$$LS_t^h = \overline{L}_t^h - L_t^h. \tag{14}$$

In equilibrium, the wage rate must be such that the labor supplied by the household equals the total demand for labor derived from the profit maximizing behavior of firms (as set out above).

Figure 2.3. Time Endowment of Household $\overline{L}_t^h$



Capital accumulation in sector *i* in period *t+1* is then given by the capital stock of period *t* net of depreciation and investment:

$$K_{i,t+1} = K_{i,t}(1-\delta_i) + I_{i,t} \qquad (15)$$

where $K_{i,t+1}$ is the capital stock in sector *i* for period *t+1*, δ_i is the sector-specific rate of depreciation, and $I_{i,t}$ is the net investment for sector *i* in period *t*.

Growth in sectoral output depends both upon the growth of employment and the growth of the capital stock in that sector. On a balanced-growth path, where all prices are constant and all real economic variables grow at a constant rate, capital stocks must grow at a rate fast enough to sustain growth. This condition can be expressed as:

$$I_{i,T} = K_{i,T}(g_i + \delta_i), \qquad (16)$$

where the subscript *T* denotes the terminal period of the model, and g_i is the growth rate for sector i in the steady state and is assumed uniform across sectors for the benchmark economy.

Although the time horizon of households and firms is infinite, in practice the model must be computed for a finite number of years. Our model is calibrated using data for 2017 and

stretches out for 33 years (i.e. through 2050). To ensure that households do not consume the capital stock prior to the (necessarily arbitrary) end point, a "transversality" condition is needed, characterizing the "steady state" that is assumed to reign after the end of the time period under consideration. We assume, following Ramsey (1928) that the economy returns to the steady state growth rate of 3 percent at the end of the final period T.

The model also requires a number of identities. After-tax income is either consumed or spent on savings (which equals investment here). Net consumption is defined as gross consumption spending less any consumption tax. The flow of savings is defined as the difference between after-tax income and gross spending on consumption, and gross investment equals national saving plus foreign direct investment.

2.5 Foreign Direct Investment and Capital Inflows

The zero trade balance is a property of a Walrasian general equilibrium model; export or import prices adjust until the demand equals supply in international markets. However, foreign direct investment (FDI) plays a crucial role in the U.S. economy as exports and imports are not automatically balanced by automatic price adjustments. Therefore the Walrasian model is modified here to incorporate capital inflows so that the FDI can pay for whenever imports exceed exports.

$$FDI_t = \sum_i PM_{i,t} M_{i,t} - \sum_i PE_{i,t} E_{i,t} \tag{17}$$

where for period t, FDI_t is the amount of net capital inflows into the U.S. economy, $\sum_i PM_{i,t} M_{i,t}$ is the volume of imports and $\sum_i PE_{i,t} E_{i,t}$ is the volume of exports.

This DCGE model assumes that the FDI is only used to import investment goods. Larger amounts of FDI increase investment, capital stock, output, utility level and lifetime well-being of households in the model.

2.6 Calibration

The model is truly "dynamic" in that it optimizes the lifetime utility of households and profits of firms over time, given their constraints, and is calibrated using SAM data for 2017. The model is programmed in General Algebraic Modeling System (GAMS) along with it Mathematical Programming for System of General Equilibrium (MPSGE) module, a specialized program that is widely used for solving DCGE models[4].

The dynamics in this model arise from an endogenous process of capital accumulation and exogenous growth rate of the labor force. We rule out uncertainty and rely on the perfect foresight of households and firms, which means that actual and expected values of variables are the same.

There are essentially five steps involved in calibration of this dynamic model. The first step relates to forming a relation between the price of commodities at period *t*, $P_{i,t}$, and the price of investment good $PINV_{i,t}$. Then, the composite investment generates capital stock in period *t+1* with price $P^k_{i,t+1}$. It also needs a link between the prices of the capital stock at periods *t* and *t+1*, $P^k_{i,t}$, $PINV_{i,t}$ and $P^k_{i,t+1}$, with due account of the rental on capital and the depreciation rate. For instance, one unit of investment made using one unit of output in period *t* generates one unit of an investment good. This then generates one unit of capital stock in period *t+1*. This implies that

$$P_{i,t} \Rightarrow PINV_{i,t} \Rightarrow P^k_{i,t+1} \tag{18}$$

where $P_{i,t}$ is the price of one output in period *t*, and $PINV_{i,t}$ and $P^k_{i,t+1}$ are the *t* period prices of one unit of investment, and capital goods, in period *t+1* in sector *i*. Capital depreciates at the rate δ_i. One unit of capital at the beginning of period *t* in sector *i* earns a rental rate $rk_{i,t}$ at time *t*, and $(1-\delta_i)$ units of it remain for the next period (or at the start of the *t+1* period), $(1-\delta_i)P^k_{t+1}$. Therefore:

[4] MPSGE was written by Thomas Rutherford for further explanation see his paper, "Applied General Equilibrium Modeling with MPSGE as a GAMS Subsystem: An Overview of the Modeling Framework and Syntax", University of Colorado, 1995; www.gams.com.

$$P_{i,t}^{k} = rk_{i,t} + (1-\delta)P_{i,t+1}^{k} \tag{19}$$

The second step involves setting up a link between the rental rate with the benchmark interest rate and the depreciation rate; the rental covers depreciation and interest payments for each unit of investment. If the rental is paid at the end of the period, then:

$$rk_{i,t} = (r+\delta_i)P_{i,t+1}^{k}, \tag{20}$$

The third step involves forming a relation between the future and the current price of capital, which is just the benchmark reference price as given by:

$$\frac{P_{i,t+1}^{k}}{P_{i,t}^{k}} = \frac{1}{1+r}. \tag{21}$$

This means that the ratio of prices of the capital at period *t* and *t+1* equals the market discount factor, $\frac{1}{1+r}$.

The fourth step involves setting up the equilibrium relationship between capital earnings (value added from capital) and the cost of capital. We compute values for sectoral capital stocks from sectoral capital earnings in the base year. If capital income in sector *i* in the base year is $\overline{V_i}$, we can write $\overline{V_i} = rk_i K_i$. Since the return to capital must be sufficient to cover interest and depreciation, we can also write

$$\overline{V_i} = (r+\delta_i)P_{i,t+1}^{k}K_i \qquad \text{or} \tag{22}$$

$$K_i = \frac{\overline{V_i}}{(r+\delta_i)} \tag{23}$$

with normalization $P_t = P_{t+1}^{k} = 1$.

The fifth step involves setting up the relation between the investment and capital earning on the balanced growth path. Investment should be enough to provide for growth and depreciation, $I_i = (g_i + \delta_i)K_i$, which implies that

$$I_i = \frac{(g_i+\delta_i)}{(r+\delta_i)}\overline{V_i}. \tag{24}$$

Thus investment per sector is tied to earnings per sector. In the benchmark equilibrium, all reference quantities grow at the rate of labor force growth, and reference prices are discounted on the basis of the benchmark rate of return. The balance between investment and earnings from capital is restored here by adjustment in the growth rate g_i, which responds to changes in the marginal productivity of capital associated to change in investment. Readjustment of capital stock and investment continues until this growth rate and the benchmark interest rates become equal.

If the growth rate in sector *i* is larger than the benchmark interest rate, then more investment will be drawn to that sector. The capital stock in that sector rises as more investment takes place. Eventually, the declining marginal productivity of capital retards growth in that sector. In addition, the DCGE model builds scenarios for open capital markets and capital inflows to evaluate the impacts of corporate tax reforms anticipated in 2017.

To solve the model, we allow for a time horizon sufficient enough to approximate the balanced-growth path for the economy. Currently the model uses a thirty-three year horizon, which can be increased if the model economy does not converge to the steady state.

3. The Current Tax System and Elasticities

The tax rates currently falling on labor and capital inputs, household income, sales of goods and services, social security and employment are presented in a set of tables in this section. A glossary describing the acronyms of the production sectors is available at the end of this paper.

Table 3.1: Taxes rates on the cost of labor input by sectors

AGRICF	0.0188	MINING	0.0580	CONSTR	0.0106	FOODPR	0.1259
APPARL	0.0584	MFRCON	0.0212	PPAPER	0.0375	CHEMIC	0.0919
ELECTR	0.0288	MVOTRA	0.0637	MFROTH	0.0970	TRANSP	0.0354
INFORM	0.0767	WHOLSA	0.0743	RETAIL	0.0939	BANKNG	0.0646
REALST	0.0052	PROTEC	0.0202	MANGAD	0.0663	HEALTH	0.0071
ENTRHO	0.0160	OTHSVC	0.0116	COMPUT	0.1103	METALS	0.0638
MACHIN	0.1046	UTILIT	0.0192	INSURS	0.0767		

Source: Derived from SAM 2017.

Table 3.2: Taxes rates on the cost of capital by sectors

AGRICF	0.0964	MINING	0.1196	CONSTR	0.0838	FOODPR	0.1740
APPARL	0.1542	MFRCON	0.0909	PPAPER	0.0963	CHEMIC	0.1052
ELECTR	0.0331	MVOTRA	0.1250	MFROTH	0.1727	TRANSP	0.1447
INFORM	0.1783	WHOLSA	0.1571	RETAIL	0.2210	BANKNG	0.0997
REALST	0.0967	PROTEC	0.1651	MANGAD	0.1581	HEALTH	0.2426
ENTRHO	0.1162	OTHSVC	0.2087	COMPUT	0.1744	METALS	0.1481
MACHIN	0.1732	UTILIT	0.1068	INSURS	0.0931		

Source: Derived from SAM 2017.

Table 3.3: Social security taxes rates paid by firms

AGRICF	0.0514	MINING	0.0593	CONSTR	0.0494	FOODPR	0.0588
APPARL	0.0416	MFRCON	0.0505	PPAPER	0.0502	CHEMIC	0.0519
COMPUT	0.0415	MVOTRA	0.0628	METALS	0.0549	MACHIN	0.0424
ELECTR	0.0481	MFROTH	0.0641	TRANSP	0.0431	INFORM	0.0732
UTILIT	0.0522	WHOLSA	0.0480	RETAIL	0.0454	BANKNG	0.0560
INSURS	0.0606	REALST	0.0645	ADMSVC	0.0967	BSVCES	0.0585
ENTRHO	0.1317	HEALTH	0.0634	OTHSVC	0.0723		

Source: Derived from SAM 2017.

Table 3.4: Sales, excise and value-added tax rates by sectors

AGRICF	0.2078	MINING	0.3439	CONSTR	0.0518	FOODPR	0.0546
APPARL	0.3431	MFRCON	0.1281	PPAPER	0.2493	CHEMIC	0.1252
ELECTR	0.0176	MVOTRA	0.1502	MFROTH	0.0631	TRANSP	0.2264
INFORM	0.1066	WHOLSA	0.0918	RETAIL	0.2096	BANKNG	0.0751
REALST	0.0386	PROTEC	0.1783	MANGAD	0.0635	HEALTH	0.0796
ENTRHO	0.0778	OTHSVC	0.0391	COMPUT	0.0607	METALS	0.0957
MACHIN	0.1591	UTILIT	0.6782	INSURS	0.0857		

Source: Derived from SAM 2017.

Table 3.5: Depreciation rates by sectors

AGRICF	0.0785	MINING	0.0770	CONSTR	0.1271	FOODPR	0.0789
APPARL	0.0740	MFRCON	0.0907	PPAPER	0.1001	CHEMIC	0.0964
ELECTR	0.1112	MVOTRA	0.1549	MFROTH	0.1226	TRANSP	0.0605
INFORM	0.1011	WHOLSA	0.1175	RETAIL	0.0634	BANKNG	0.1066
REALST	0.0267	PROTEC	0.1801	MANGAD	0.1119	HEALTH	0.0673
ENTRHO	0.0618	OTHSVC	0.0493	COMPUT	0.1925	METALS	0.0717
MACHIN	0.0995	UTILIT	0.0376	INSURS	0.1331		

Source: Derived from SAM 2017.

Table 3.6: Social security tax rates by households

DCL1	0.1551	DCL2	0.1551	DCL3	0.1551	DCL4	0.1551	DCL5	0.1551
DCL6	0.1551	DCL7	0.1551	DCL8	0.1551	DCL9	0.1551	DCL10	0.1551

Source: Derived from SAM 2017.

An overview of tax rate figures from Tables 3.1-3.6 above convinces us that that the current structure of taxes in the US economy is complex. The current system is neither efficient nor economical, nor good for horizontal or vertical equality among individuals in the US economy.

3.2 Elasticity parameters

Elasticities of substitution measure the responses of relative changes in quantities to relative changes prices of goods and services and factors of production in the economy. More flexible markets have larger values of elasticities. A dynamic CGE model is constructed with sets of elasticities in consumption, production, trade and inter-temporal choices of households and firms. Key sets of these elasticities used in the model are provided in the tables in this section.

Table 3.7: Elasticity of substitution in production

AGRICF	0.9	MINING	0.8	CONSTR	0.9	FOODPR	0.9
APPARL	0.9	MFRCON	0.8	PPAPER	0.8	CHEMIC	0.8
COMPUT	0.9	MVOTRA	0.9	METALS	0.8	MACHIN	0.8
ELECTR	0.9	MFROTH	0.9	TRANSP	0.9	INFORM	0.9
UTILIT	0.8	WHOLSA	0.9	RETAIL	0.9	BANKNG	0.9
INSURS	0.9	REALST	0.9	ADMSVC	0.8	BSVCES	0.8
ENTRHO	0.8	HEALTH	0.8	OTHSVC	0.8		

Source: Fair Tax Model, BHT (2015).

Table 3.8: Elasticity of transformation of domestic products in exports

AGRICF	2	MINING	2	CONSTR	2	FOODPR	2
APPARL	2	MFRCON	2	PPAPER	2	CHEMIC	2
COMPUT	2	MVOTRA	2	METALS	2	MACHIN	2
ELECTR	2	MFROTH	2	TRANSP	2	INFORM	2
UTILIT	2	WHOLSA	2	RETAIL	2	BANKNG	2
INSURS	2	REALST	2	ADMSVC	2	BSVCES	2
ENTRHO	2	HEALTH	2	OTHSVC	2		

Source: Fair Tax Model, BHT (2015).

Table 3.9: Elasticity of transformation of imports

AGRICF	1.65	MINING	1.65	CONSTR	1.65	FOODPR	1.65
APPARL	1.65	MFRCON	1.65	PPAPER	1.65	CHEMIC	1.65
COMPUT	1.65	MVOTRA	1.65	METALS	1.65	MACHIN	1.65
ELECTR	1.65	MFROTH	1.65	TRANSP	1.65	INFORM	1.65
UTILIT	1.65	WHOLSA	0.65	RETAIL	0.65	BANKNG	1.65
INSURS	1.65	REALST	1.65	ADMSVC	1.65	BSVCES	1.65
ENTRHO	0.65	HEALTH	0.65	OTHSVC	0.65		

Source: Fair Tax Model, BHT (2015).

The NCPA-DCGE model is calibrated to input-output data obtained from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and projected to 2017. The model contains 10 household groups organized by income deciles and 27 production sectors. Its horizon spans the period 2017 to 2050.

Table 3.10: Other Key parameters of the model

Steady state growth rate for sectors (g)	0.03
Net interest rate in non-distorted economy (r *or* ϱ)	0.04
Sector specific depreciation rates (δ_i)	0.02 – 0.19
Elasticity of substitution in domestic returns and capital flows, σ_k	1.4
Elasticity of substitution for composite investment, σ	1.3
Elasticity of transformation between U.S. domestic supplies and exports to the Rest of the World (ROW), σ_ε (can be sector-specific)	2.0
Elasticity of substitution between U.S. domestic products and imports from the Rest of the World (ROW), σ_m	1.5
Inter-temporal elasticity of substitution, σ_{Lu}	0.98
Intra-temporal elasticity of substitution between leisure and composite goods, σ	1.5
Elasticity of substitution in consumption goods across sectors, σ_C	1.5
Elasticity of substitution between capital and labor, σ_v	1.2
Reference quantity index of output, capital and labor for each sector, Q_{rf}	$(1+g)^{t-1}$
Reference index of price of output, capital and labor for each sector, P_{rf}	$1/(1+r)^{t-1}$

Source: Fair Tax Model, BHT (2015).

This is a large model with 50,662 variables. Equilibrium is unique and stable for a range of values of these sets of parameters. The values of parameters used in this analysis are given in Tables 3.1 to 3.12.

4. Results of the DCGE with Corporate Tax Reforms

Our analysis begins with a central specification with 50 percent reduction in the corporate tax rate across all sectors. The corporate tax base is defined as the total revenue of a firm minus the costs intermediate inputs, wages and imported inputs. At the macro level our analysis focuses on the impacts on real GDP, employment, wages, investment, consumption, exports, and imports. We then consider the micro details of households and firms to determine the impacts of tax reforms on the distribution of income, labor supply and consumption among households, and output, investment, capital accumulation and prices for each of the 27 production sectors.

4.1 Impacts on Economic Growth

The macroeconomic impacts of a 50 percent reduction in corporate taxes are very powerful. Real GDP expands relative to the benchmark, initially by 1.6 percent and ultimately by 4.3 percent. This increase in output is made possible by an increase in investment and capital accumulation, and an associated increase in the level of employment in the economy. More saving lowers the growth rate of consumption initially, but it rises to 3.5 percent above the benchmark by 2042[5]. The detailed time profile of the macro impacts is shown in Table 4.1 and in Figures 4.1 to 4.6 in this section. The macro impacts of alternative taxes are presented in Section 5.

Table 4.1 Summary of Effects of 50 percent reduction in corporate income tax rate (relative to benchmark, % change), 2017-2042.

Year	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2027	2032	2037	2042
Period	1	2	3	4	5	10	15	20	25
Real GDP	1.6	1.7	1.9	2.2	2.4	3.4	3.8	4.1	4.3
Investment	7.2	7.1	7.2	7.4	7.4	7.7	7.8	7.9	8.1
Capital stock	0.0	0.2	0.8	1.4	1.9	4.3	5.6	6.4	7.0
Employment	2.9	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5
Consumption	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.9	1.3	2.6	3.1	3.4	3.5

[5] Tables in this section are up to 2042 for space reasons. Figures show results up to 2050.



Both investment and capital stock keep rising under the tax-change scenario relative to benchmark as shown on Figures 4.3 and 4.4. GDP is above the benchmark economy for most of the years. This is possible because of the increase in capital accumulation that raises the productivity of workers. Similarly, total employment also rises in the beginning relative to the benchmark because the abundantly available capital results in more demand for labor. Total investment also follows the pattern of total output.



Figure 4.3: Investment under the tax reforms relative to the benchmark



Figure 4.4: Capital stock under the tax reforms relative to the benchmark







4.2 Impacts on the distribution of income

The income of households rises under the rate reduction as shown in table 4.2. Thus the redistributive impacts of reforms are very encouraging (See Figures 4.7-4.8.).

Table 4.2. Summary of Relative Effects in income of households due to 50 percent reduction in the corporate income taxes

Year	2017	2022	2027	2032	2037	2042	2047	2050
Period	1	5	10	15	20	25	30	33
				% change in income				
Decile1	3.13	2.12	1.62	1.35	1.23	1.25	1.38	1.51
Decile2	1.70	1.23	0.85	0.66	0.59	0.62	0.76	0.89
Decile3	1.30	1.02	0.69	0.52	0.47	0.52	0.66	0.80
Decile4	1.68	1.29	0.93	0.74	0.68	0.72	0.87	1.00
Decile5	1.18	1.02	0.71	0.55	0.51	0.57	0.72	0.86
Decile6	1.16	0.99	0.68	0.52	0.48	0.54	0.69	0.83
Decile7	1.12	0.97	0.67	0.51	0.47	0.53	0.69	0.83
Decile8	0.87	0.82	0.55	0.40	0.37	0.44	0.60	0.74
Decile9	1.21	1.01	0.70	0.53	0.49	0.54	0.69	0.83
Decile10	2.25	1.72	1.33	1.12	1.05	1.09	1.24	1.39



Figure 4.8: Income of richest two deciles under the tax reforms relative to the benchmark



Figure 4.9: Wellbeing of poorest three deciles under the tax reforms relative to the benchmark



Table 4.3. Summary of Relative Effects of the Corporate Tax Reforms on Household Utility

Year	2017	2022	2027	2032	2037	2042	2047	2050
Period	1	5	10	15	20	25	30	33
				% change in wellbeing of households				
Decile1	-3.85	-2.01	-1.12	-0.75	-0.69	-0.83	-1.11	-1.34
Decile2	-1.03	0.73	1.61	1.97	2.03	1.88	1.59	1.36
Decile3	-0.61	1.04	1.89	2.24	2.29	2.15	1.86	1.62
Decile4	-0.85	0.74	1.58	1.93	1.98	1.83	1.55	1.31
Decile5	-0.45	1.05	1.86	2.20	2.25	2.10	1.81	1.58
Decile6	-0.45	1.07	1.89	2.23	2.28	2.14	1.85	1.61
Decile7	-0.41	1.08	1.90	2.24	2.28	2.14	1.85	1.62
Decile8	-0.28	1.18	1.99	2.33	2.37	2.23	1.94	1.71
Decile9	-0.46	1.01	1.82	2.16	2.20	2.06	1.77	1.53
Decile10	-1.15	0.20	0.96	1.28	1.32	1.17	0.88	0.65
				% change in labor supply				
Decile1	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08
Decile2	0.04	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.17
Decile3	0.04	0.19	0.21	0.22	0.24	0.26	0.29	0.30
Decile4	0.09	0.26	0.28	0.30	0.32	0.34	0.37	0.40
Decile5	0.05	0.29	0.32	0.34	0.37	0.41	0.46	0.49
Decile6	0.04	0.27	0.30	0.32	0.35	0.38	0.43	0.46
Decile7	0.04	0.28	0.31	0.34	0.36	0.40	0.45	0.48
Decile8	0.02	0.27	0.31	0.33	0.36	0.40	0.46	0.50
Decile9	0.05	0.26	0.29	0.31	0.34	0.37	0.42	0.45
Decile10	0.27	0.56	0.60	0.63	0.66	0.71	0.77	0.81
				% change in consumption				
Decile1	-3.86	-1.97	-1.07	-0.70	-0.64	-0.78	-1.06	-1.29
Decile2	-1.04	0.88	1.81	2.20	2.26	2.11	1.82	1.59
Decile3	-0.64	1.35	2.30	2.69	2.75	2.61	2.31	2.08
Decile4	-0.88	1.10	2.06	2.45	2.52	2.37	2.08	1.85
Decile5	-0.49	1.55	2.53	2.93	3.00	2.85	2.56	2.32
Decile6	-0.49	1.54	2.52	2.92	2.98	2.84	2.55	2.31
Decile7	-0.45	1.57	2.56	2.96	3.03	2.89	2.60	2.36
Decile8	-0.32	1.71	2.70	3.11	3.18	3.03	2.74	2.51
Decile9	-0.50	1.46	2.42	2.81	2.87	2.73	2.44	2.20
Decile10	-1.19	0.80	1.77	2.17	2.24	2.09	1.80	1.57

Labor supplies of households in all deciles rise relative to the benchmark. This is the result of growth in both in supply and demand for labor following the growth of GDP. Only households in the poorest decile are worse off in terms of wellbeing and consumption, as the

reduction in revenue causes a reduction in government transfer payments going to these households.



4.3 **Government Revenue, Spending and Employment**

Government revenue declines because of the reduction in the corporate income taxes, but it begins to recover in the following years as the bases of other taxes rise because of the expansion in the economy.



International Trade

The level of exports and imports both expand under the corporate tax reforms, but exports increase faster than imports. Thus, the expansionary impacts of corporate tax reforms are helpful in solving the initial imbalances in trade. This is because lower corporate taxes encourage domestic firms to produce at home and attract firms located in other countries to produce in the US.



4.5 Sectoral analysis

Every sector is growing faster with the reforms in the corporate income taxes than without reforms. The machinery and instrument, real estate, and computer sectors grow faster than any other sectors. These sectoral growth rates come mainly from the increased stock of capital across sectors and the creation of more jobs across sectors. Under this reform experiment, the construction sector grows the least among all sectors, this is a puzzle that will be investigated further.

Table 4.4. Percent Change in Real Output, Relative to Benchmark, by Sector

Year	2017	2022	2027	2032	2037	2042
Period	**1**	**5**	**10**	**15**	**20**	**25**
Industry						
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	2.9	4.4	5.1	5.4	5.6	5.7
Mining	3.5	5.5	6.4	6.8	7.1	7.4
Construction	-2.5	-1.0	-0.2	0.3	0.8	1.2
Food and tobacco products	0.8	2.7	3.6	4.0	4.1	4.1
Textiles and apparel	2.3	3.4	4.7	5.0	5.1	5.1
Building materials	1.8	2.7	3.4	3.7	3.9	4.1
Paper and publishing	2.2	2.9	3.5	3.8	4.0	4.2
Chemicals, petroleum, rubber and plastics	1.6	3.9	5.0	5.6	6.0	6.2
Electronics and electronic equipment	0.4	0.7	1.3	1.8	2.2	2.6
Motor vehicles and other transportation	3.4	3.9	4.5	4.8	4.9	5.0
Other manufacturing	1.7	4.1	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8
Transportation	2.8	3.4	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.3
Communications	3.7	4.0	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.9
Wholesale trade	2.3	3.0	3.6	3.9	4.0	4.0
Retail trade	2.5	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.4
Banking	2.5	3.3	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.7
Real estate	1.4	4.8	5.9	6.4	6.8	7.1
Personal and repair services	0.8	1.2	1.8	2.1	2.3	2.5
Management and administration	1.5	2.3	3.0	3.4	3.7	3.9
Health services	0.8	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.7
Entertainment and hotel services	1.1	1.7	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4
Other services	0.7	1.5	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.8
Computers	2.7	5.0	5.4	5.6	5.7	5.8
Primary and fabricated metal	1.8	2.8	3.6	4.1	4.4	4.7
Machinery and instruments	5.4	7.2	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4
Electricity - gas – sanitary	3.5	4.6	5.3	5.7	6.1	6.4
Insurance	1.2	2.9	4.3	5.0	5.4	5.5

The demand and supply for products in the markets increase because of the rise in the income of households and more investment by firms, leading to expansion across all sectors. The sectors that are more efficient attract more capital and create more jobs and grow faster. The underlying elasticities of substitution in consumption, production and trade also matter for the flexibility of markets and growth rates across these sectors.

Table 4.5. Percent Change in Capital Stock, Relative to Benchmark, by Sector

Year	2017	2022	2027	2032	2037	2042
Period	**1**	**5**	**10**	**15**	**20**	**25**
Industry						
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.0	4.0	6.1	7.4	8.1	8.6
Mining	0.0	5.2	7.2	8.3	9.1	9.7
Construction	0.0	-1.6	1.3	3.1	4.3	5.3
Food and tobacco products	0.0	2.4	4.7	6.0	6.8	7.2
Textiles and apparel	0.0	0.0	6.2	7.8	8.9	9.6
Building materials	0.0	2.0	4.9	6.4	7.3	8.0
Paper and publishing	0.0	2.8	5.2	6.6	7.5	8.2
Chemicals, petroleum, rubber and plastics	0.0	4.3	6.1	7.1	7.7	8.1
Electronics and electronic equipment	0.0	0.6	1.8	2.6	3.2	3.8
Motor vehicles and other transportation	0.0	4.7	7.1	8.4	9.2	9.8
Other manufacturing	0.0	4.4	6.9	8.3	9.2	9.8
Transportation	0.0	1.8	4.5	6.0	7.1	7.8
Communications	0.0	3.7	6.0	7.3	8.2	8.9
Wholesale trade	0.0	2.8	5.2	6.7	7.6	8.3
Retail trade	0.0	1.9	4.5	6.1	7.0	7.6
Banking	0.0	3.3	5.6	6.9	7.8	8.4
Real estate	0.0	4.4	5.8	6.6	7.1	7.5
Personal and repair services	0.0	0.1	3.0	4.7	5.9	6.7
Management and administration	0.0	1.5	4.3	6.0	7.2	8.1
Health services	0.0	-3.8	-1.3	0.0	0.7	1.0
Entertainment and hotel services	0.0	0.4	3.0	4.5	5.4	6.0
Other services	0.0	-2.4	0.3	1.9	2.7	3.2
Computers	0.0	6.0	8.3	9.6	10.5	11.1
Primary and fabricated metal	0.0	1.8	4.4	6.1	7.2	8.1
Machinery and instruments	0.0	5.6	8.1	9.5	10.4	11.0
Electricity - gas – sanitary	0.0	3.6	5.5	6.8	7.6	8.3
Insurance	0.0	3.5	5.9	7.3	8.1	8.7

Table 4.6. Percent Change in Employment, Relative to Benchmark, by Sector

Year	2017	2022	2027	2032	2037	2042
Period	**1**	**5**	**10**	**15**	**20**	**25**
Industry						
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	6.3	5.4	5.0	4.8	4.6	4.6
Mining	6.4	7.0	6.4	6.1	6.0	6.0
Construction	-2.3	-0.4	0.0	0.4	0.8	1.1
Food and tobacco products	7.1	5.4	5.3	5.1	5.0	4.8
Textiles and apparel	7.3	7.3	6.2	6.4	6.5	6.6
Building materials	4.4	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9
Paper and publishing	4.8	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1
Chemicals, petroleum, rubber and plastics	21.1	5.9	5.2	4.7	4.4	4.2
Electronics and electronic equipment	2.3	1.4	0.1	-0.5	-0.7	-0.7
Motor vehicles and other transportation	7.5	6.6	6.5	6.3	6.2	6.2
Other manufacturing	10.6	7.5	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.3
Transportation	3.8	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
Communications	7.4	6.9	6.7	6.6	6.6	6.6
Wholesale trade	5.7	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Retail trade	6.6	6.5	6.7	6.7	6.8	6.8
Banking	5.6	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.3
Real estate	10.7	5.8	4.7	4.1	3.7	3.5
Personal and repair services	1.0	2.9	3.3	3.6	3.9	4.1
Management and administration	0.9	4.1	4.4	4.7	5.0	5.3
Health services	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.1
Entertainment and hotel services	1.8	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Other services	0.8	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.0
Computers	10.9	9.2	8.9	8.7	8.6	8.7
Primary and fabricated metal	1.7	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.8	5.0
Machinery and instruments	12.7	8.8	8.7	8.6	8.5	8.6
Electricity - gas – sanitary	5.9	5.1	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.4
Insurance	5.4	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.5

Table 4.7. Percent Change in relative prices, Relative to Benchmark, by Sector

Year	2017	2022	2027	2032	2037	2042
Period	**1**	**5**	**10**	**15**	**20**	**25**
Industry						
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	-1.0	-2.7	-3.7	-4.2	-4.3	-4.2
Mining	-2.3	-3.1	-4.2	-4.6	-4.7	-4.7
Construction	-1.5	-2.1	-2.8	-3.0	-3.0	-2.8
Food and tobacco products	-1.5	-3.2	-4.1	-4.5	-4.6	-4.5
Textiles and apparel	-1.2	-2.4	-3.4	-3.7	-3.8	-3.6
Building materials	-1.3	-2.4	-3.2	-3.6	-3.6	-3.4
Paper and publishing	-1.4	-2.6	-3.5	-3.9	-4.0	-3.8
Chemicals, petroleum, rubber and plastics	-1.0	-3.4	-4.6	-5.2	-5.4	-5.3
Electronics and electronic equipment	-1.1	-2.2	-3.3	-3.8	-3.9	-3.8
Motor vehicles and other transportation	-1.4	-2.8	-3.8	-4.2	-4.3	-4.1
Other manufacturing	-1.0	-2.7	-3.6	-3.9	-4.0	-3.8
Transportation	-1.5	-2.7	-3.4	-3.6	-3.6	-3.4
Communications	-2.3	-3.4	-4.2	-4.5	-4.6	-4.4
Wholesale trade	-1.7	-2.8	-3.6	-3.8	-3.8	-3.6
Retail trade	-1.5	-3.7	-4.3	-4.4	-4.4	-4.1
Banking	-1.1	-2.5	-3.5	-4.0	-4.1	-4.0
Real estate	1.3	-3.6	-5.1	-5.8	-6.0	-6.0
Personal and repair services	-1.8	-1.8	-2.3	-2.4	-2.3	-2.0
Management and administration	-3.0	-2.3	-3.0	-3.2	-3.1	-2.9
Health services	-1.0	-2.0	-2.4	-2.5	-2.4	-2.2
Entertainment and hotel services	-1.3	-2.4	-3.0	-3.3	-3.2	-3.0
Other services	-1.0	-2.1	-2.7	-2.8	-2.7	-2.5
Computers	-0.6	-2.4	-3.4	-3.7	-3.8	-3.6
Primary and fabricated metal	-2.6	-2.7	-3.5	-3.8	-3.9	-3.7
Machinery and instruments	0.3	-2.2	-3.3	-3.8	-3.9	-3.7
Electricity - gas – sanitary	-2.1	-3.4	-4.5	-5.0	-5.1	-5.1
Insurance	-1.0	-2.9	-4.3	-5.0	-5.2	-5.3

Prices are lower relative to the benchmark because of the reduction in the cost production due to lower taxes of capital input.

5. Macro Impacts of Alternative Corporate Income Tax Rates

Here we consider 100 and 25 percent reductions in the rate of corporate income tax across sectors, and replacing the existing corporate income tax rates with a 10 percent uniform rate across all sectors. Due to space limitations and the focus of this paper, only the macro effects of these alternative reform scenarios are reported here in Tables 5.1 to 5.3.

Table 5.1. Summary of Effects of 100 percent reduction in corporate income tax rate (relative to benchmark, % change), 2017-2042.

Year	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2027**	**2032**	**2037**	**2042**
Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**10**	**15**	**20**	**25**
Real GDP	3.3	3.6	4.2	4.7	5.3	7.3	8.3	8.9	9.4
Investment	15.7	15.7	16.1	16.4	16.5	17.2	17.5	17.9	18.4
Capital stock	0.0	0.5	1.8	3.2	4.4	9.7	12.5	14.4	15.8
Employment	6.1	6.8	6.8	6.9	6.9	7.1	7.1	7.2	7.3
Consumption	-0.6	0.1	0.9	1.5	2.3	5.1	6.3	6.9	7.1

Table 5.2. Summary of Effects of 25 percent reduction in corporate income tax rate (relative to benchmark, % change), 2017-2042.

Year	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2027	2032	2037	2042
Period	1	2	3	4	5	10	15	20	25
Real GDP	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.6	1.8	2.0	2.1
Investment	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.8
Capital stock	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.9	2.0	2.6	3.0	3.3
Employment	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
Consumption	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	1.3	1.6	1.7	1.7

Table 5.3. Summary of Effects of 10 percent uniform corporate income tax rates (relative to benchmark, % change), 2017-2042.

Year	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2027	2032	2037	2042
Period	1	2	3	4	5	10	15	20	25
Real GDP	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Investment	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5
Capital stock	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	1.0	1.3	1.4	1.5
Employment	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Consumption	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1

6. Conclusion

The reduction of the corporate tax rate changes output, investment, capital accumulation, and employment. This raises the level of consumption and lifetime utilities of households. Exports and imports expand. A DCGE model captures the details of prices, output, employment and investment by sector and income, as well as labor supply and utility for each decile of households. Both the growth and redistributional effects of reforms result in a slimmer public sector.

The model is also able to identify the complexity of the current tax system with detailed information on labor, and capital input taxes across sector, and sales, household income and social security taxes.

7. References

Angelini J. P. and D.G. Tuerck. 2015. The U.S. Corporate Income Tax: A Primer for U.S. Policymakers. The Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University. http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/sp_The%20U.S.%20Corporate%20Income%20Tax.pdf.

Arulampalam, W., M. P. Devereux, and G. Maffini. 2012. The Direct Incidence of Corporate Income Tax on Wages. *European Economic Review*, *56*(6), 1038-1054.

Bhattarai K., J. Haughton and D.G. Tuerck. 2015. Fiscal Policy, Growth and Income Distribution in the UK, *Applied Economics and Finance* (2:3):20-36.

Bhattarai K., J. Haughton and D.G. Tuerck (2015) The Economic Effects of the Fair Tax: Analysis of Results of a Dynamic CGE Model of the US Economy, *International Economics and Economic Policy*, forthcoming.

Hall, R.E. and A, Rabushka. 1985. *The Flat Tax*, Hoover Press.

Leibrecht, M. and C. Hochgatterer. 2012. Tax Competition as a Cause of Falling Corporate Income Tax Rates: A Survey of Empirical Literature. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, (26)4: 616-48.

Mirrlees J., S., Adam, T., Besley, R., Blundell, S., Bond, R., Chote, M., Gammie, P. J., Myles, G., & Poterba, J. 2010, Dimensions of Tax Design: The Mirrlees Review, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Overesch, M. and J. Rincke, 2011. What Drives Corporate Tax Rates Down? A Reassessment of Globalization, Tax Competition, and Dynamic Adjustment to Shocks. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 113: 579–602. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9442.2011.01650.x.

U.S. Council of Economic Advisers. 2015. *Economic Report of the President*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington DC.

Zellner, A., and J.K. Ngoie. 2015. Evaluation of the Effects of Reduced Personal and Corporate Tax Rates on the Growth Rates of the U.S. Economy *Econometric Reviews* 34, (1-5):56-81.

8. Glossary for Sectors

AGRICF	Agriculture, forestry and fishing
MINING	Mining
CONSTR	Construction
FOODPR	Food and tobacco products
APPARL	Textiles and apparel
MFRCON	Building materials
PPAPER	Paper and publishing
CHEMIC	Chemicals, petroleum, rubber and plastics
ELECTR	Electronics and electronic equipment
MVOTRA	Motor vehicles and other transportation
MFROTH	Other manufacturing
TRANSP	Transportation
INFORM	Communications
WHOLSA	Wholesale trade
RETAIL	Retail trade
BANKNG	Banking
REALST	Real estate
PROTEC	Personal and repair services
MANGAD	Management and administration
HEALTH	Health services
ENTRHO	Entertainment and hotel services
OTHSVC	Other services
COMPUT	Computers
METALS	Primary and fabricated metal
MACHIN	Machinery and instruments
UTILIT	Electricity - gas – sanitary
INSURS	Insurance