



*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

**Give to AgEcon Search**

AgEcon Search


<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

International Agricultural Trade  
Research Consortium



EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL MARKET EFFECTS  
AND GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN MALAYSIA'S  
AGRICULTURAL SECTOR: A COMPUTABLE GENERAL  
EQUILIBRIUM FRAMEWORK

by

Kim Leng Yeah, John F. Yanagida & Hiroshi Yamauchi\*

Working Paper # 93-8

The International Agricultural Trade Research Consortium is an informal association of University and Government economists interested in agricultural trade. Its purpose is to foster interaction, improve research capacity and to focus on relevant trade policy issues. It is financed by United States Department of Agriculture (ERS, FAS, and CSRS), Agriculture Canada and the participating institutions.

The IATRC Working Paper series provides members an opportunity to circulate their work at the advanced draft stage through limited distribution within the research and analysis community. The IATRC takes no political positions or responsibility for the accuracy of the data or validity of the conclusions presented by working paper authors. Further, policy recommendations and opinions expressed by the authors do not necessarily reflect those of the IATRC or its funding agencies.

This paper should not be quoted without the author(s) permission.

\*The authors, Yeah is a former graduate student and Yanagida & Yamauchi are Professors, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Correspondence or requests for additional copies of this paper should be addressed to:

Hiroshi Yamauchi  
University of Hawaii @ Manoa  
Department of Agricultural & Resource Economics  
3050 Maile Way - Gilmore 104  
Honolulu, HI 96822

October 1993

**EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL MARKET EFFECTS AND GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN  
MALAYSIA'S AGRICULTURAL SECTOR: A COMPUTABLE GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM FRAMEWORK**

**ABSTRACT**

An eight-sector, single-period, agricultural-focused computable general equilibrium (CGE) model of Malaysia using 1983 as the base year was developed to evaluate effects from changes in the external trade environment and domestic economic policies. The simulation results demonstrate the growing resiliency of the increasingly diversified Malaysian economy to external shocks. Also, they point to the domestic economy's ability to buffer internal policy-induced distortions.

## **Evaluation of External Market Effects and Government Intervention in Malaysia's Agricultural Sector: A Computable General Equilibrium Framework**

In a market economy, intersectoral linkages and the macroeconomic environment have a pervasive influence on agricultural development. As evident in the pattern of agricultural protectionism in the world, these linkages are often poorly understood or ignored in policy analyses and implementation. Most industrialized countries protect and subsidize agriculture while developing countries tax this sector.<sup>1</sup> Such widespread interventions have distorted world agricultural production and prevented it from growing and developing along the lines of comparative advantage among countries.

An economy-wide, multisectoral framework is needed to analyze the macroeconomic influences, particularly the various inter-relationships that affect agricultural development. Of the multisectoral models that have been developed for economy-wide analysis, the computable general equilibrium (CGE) models represent the most advanced analytical tool. The lineage of CGE models can be traced to the input-output models of the early 1950s used for development planning. They have been extensively used on issues involving international trade, development planning, public finance, environmental and resource management, structural adjustment and transition to a market economy.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the economy-wide and sectoral effects of changes in the external trade environment and domestic economic policies on the agricultural development of Malaysia. Specifically, a static computable general equilibrium model of the Malaysian economy with a disaggregated agricultural sector is formulated to:

1. estimate the effects on output, trade, welfare, and resource allocation of external economic environmental changes in the form of a decline in the agricultural commodity export price.
2. evaluate the economy-wide and sectoral effects of removing agricultural export taxes.

The scope of this research also includes providing further insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the CGE methodology for agricultural policy analysis.

The first analysis focuses on the export agriculture sector which encompasses Malaysia's two primary agricultural commodities, rubber and palm oil. Heavily dependent on exports of rubber in the 1950s and 1960s, Malaysia has since built a more diversified economy with strong emphasis on manufacturing. Export agriculture, however, is still an important component of the national economy.

The second objective examines the influence of domestic policy on agricultural development. Commodity taxes are a major instrument for the government to intervene in domestic markets. This measure is popular because of its ease of implementation and indirectness of its impact. The importance of these indirect effects increases with the strength of intersectoral linkages in the product and factor markets.

Subsequent sections of this paper include a description of the Malaysian

economy with emphasis on the agricultural sector, a summary of the use of computable general equilibrium (CGE) models for agricultural policy analysis, description of the data used in this study and estimation results. The last section summarizes our results and discusses implications for the development of Malaysia's agricultural sector.

### **The Malaysian Economy and Agricultural Sector**

Malaysia is located in Southeast Asia with a land area totaling 330,434 sq. km. and a 1990 population of approximately 18 million people. Its economic performance since gaining independence from the British in 1957 is regarded as among the most successful in Southeast Asia.

Malaysia's impressive economic growth since the 1950s is exemplified by the rise in annual per capita real income from M\$821 in 1960 to M\$3,675 by 1980, and M\$4,424 by 1990. Its annual rate of growth in gross domestic product averaged 5.2% between 1960-70, 8.3% between 1970-80 and 6.1% between 1980-90. These periods of growth correspond to developmental phases that can be characterized as follows. Overly dependent in the 1950s and 1960s on two primary commodities, rubber and tin, the country began its drive toward economic diversification and industrialization after its independence. The enactment of the Pioneer Industries Ordinance in 1958 is considered to have been successful in promoting import-substitution industries based on imported technology and materials. Concurrently, in the 1960s, large-scale land development continually absorbed the growing rural population, reducing poverty and expanding and diversifying agricultural production.

The early industrialization efforts, characterized by import substitution in the light manufacturing sector, continued throughout the 1960s. Since the import-substitution industries were constrained by small domestic markets, the government revised its industrialization policies in 1968 by enacting the Investment Incentive Act. This Act shifted the incentive towards export-oriented manufacturing based on domestic materials. By the end of the Second Malaysian Plan (1971-75), the manufacturing sector had increased its share of GDP to 16.4% as compared to 10.4% in 1965 and 8.2% in 1955.

In the early 1980s, the government intensified its industrialization drive with an import-substitution strategy focusing on the heavy industries, e.g., pulp and paper, automobiles, cement and steel billet. This emphasis on resource-based and capital-intensive industries followed an increasingly competitive environment for labor-intensive light manufacturing industries as other developing countries, such as Indonesia and Thailand, embarked on similar export-oriented industrialization.

Over a 35-year span, from 1955 to 1990, the share of agriculture in the gross domestic product has declined from 40% to 19% (Table 1). The structural change in the economy is most distinctive in the growth of the industrial sector where, in 1987, manufacturing overtook agriculture as the leading sector.

The declining importance of agriculture reflects the acceleration in the economic diversification of the country, the downward trend in world demand

and prices, and increasing competition from other producer countries. Nevertheless, the agricultural sector remains important not only because it comprises one-fifth of GDP but also because its continuous growth is vital for employment, eradication of poverty and ensuring a balanced development between the urban and rural sectors.

Malaysia is the world's largest producer of natural rubber and palm oil and the third largest producer of cocoa. In 1987, its world share of rubber amounted to 41%, 69% for palm oil and 9% for cocoa. Hence agricultural production in Malaysia is dominated by export crops which comprise about 80% of the cultivated area and 75% of the value of agricultural output.

Agricultural production in Malaysia is labor intensive and labor costs account for more than 50% of the total production costs of all major export crops. Substitution of capital for labor is limited because rubber tapping and palm oil harvesting have not been successfully mechanized. Hence, labor availability is critical for the expansion of export crops. Currently, there is a general shortage of labor in this subsector, and immigrant labor, both legal and illegal, has been used to meet this shortfall.

Agricultural imports declined in the 1960s; the average annual reduction was 4% in real terms. In the 1970s, imports rose at a rate of about 22% per year largely due to the rapid increase in food imports. Between 1983-88, food imports accounted for 70-80% of total agricultural imports and between 8-9% of total merchandise imports.

World prices have a major impact on export earnings and consequently on



Malaysia's GDP. It was estimated that reduced agricultural commodity prices in 1985 resulted in a decline of 16% in export earnings and 3% in the country's GDP (Abdul Aziz, 1991). The real price of rubber has been declining steadily since 1960 while palm oil showed the greatest decline in the 1980s. Both commodity prices have declined by about 50% since the early 1960s.

### **Use of CGE Models for Agricultural Policy Analysis**

Computable general equilibrium (CGE) techniques were developed in the early 1970s to solve for both market prices and quantities simultaneously, thus simulating the workings of a competitive market economy. The first applied CGE model was developed by Johansen (1960) to analyze growth and resource allocation issues in the Norwegian economy. Adelman and Robinson (1978) were the first to use a CGE model for a developing country. They used the model to analyze issues of income distribution and poverty incidence in Korea. Subsequent advancement in computing power and solution algorithms have widened the use of CGE models for policy analysis. They have proved to be a valuable analytical tool in the study of public finance, international trade, economic development, macroeconomics and natural resources.<sup>2</sup> In the development literature, multisectoral and multifactor CGE models are widely used to assess trade, industrialization, growth and structural change, urbanization, and , macroeconomic stabilization and distribution issues.<sup>3</sup> More recently, they have been applied to environmental policy analyses and to issues involving trade integration and transition from centrally planned to market economies.<sup>4</sup>

The advantages of a CGE model over an econometric model such as the one in

Timmer (1984) include:

- (i) its general equilibrium nature is better suited for economy-wide policy analysis because reliable time-series data are usually not available for developing countries, and changes in policy regimes cast doubts on the validity of the econometric results (the Lucas critique);
- (ii) it captures national income and product, including input-output information, and incorporates mechanisms for achieving balance among the macro aggregates;
- (iii) it specifies explicitly production and demand behavior and the trade and resource allocation mechanisms, thereby providing market realism, as well as consistency with microeconomic theory;
- (iv) the transparency and numerical solvability of the model make it a useful tool for bridging the gap between the planner, theorist, and the policy-maker in handling complex multisectoral issues.

The first criticism of CGE modeling is its assumption of static equilibrium, whereby dynamic changes, especially technological advances are difficult to model. Another weakness of CGE modeling is its dependence on the type of 'macro closure' of the model which reflects the assumptions used in reconciling the financial balances to achieve equilibrium. The third criticism is that the structuralists' extensions of the neoclassical paradigm are ad hoc and not based on received theory.

Responses to these perceived weaknesses and criticisms follow. Dynamic, forward-looking models, where consumers maximize utility and producers maximize profits intertemporally have been recently developed (Wilcoxon, 1986; Goulder and Summers, 1986; Go, 1988; Jorgenson and Wilcoxon, 1990). However, endogenizing technical progress remains a difficult problem, not because of the limitations of the CGE modeling approach, but because of an inadequate theoretical framework. The issue of closure is important. As shown by Robinson, Kilkenney and Hansen (1990) for the U.S. economy, the gains from agricultural liberalization depend on microeconomic and macroeconomic conditions. They found that labor mobility is a crucial microeconomic condition for gains from liberalization and that the economy-wide gains depend on the impact of the policy change on the macroeconomic aggregates, such as the budget and/or trade deficits. The useful and intuitive insights provided by CGE models have led modelers to ignore the third major criticism of CGE models. Nevertheless, they argue that, unless a better theoretical paradigm is forthcoming, CGE models provide a useful analytical tool to bridge the gap between the real world and abstract models for policy analysis (Dervis, et al., 1982; Robinson, 1989).

General equilibrium models have become a popular tool for analyzing issues involving the effects of agricultural price policies and trade liberalization. The focus of these studies varies by country and product aggregates.

World models typically are used to predict changes in trade and production patterns and world market prices. Examples of such models are the World Agricultural Liberalization Study (WALRAS) developed by the Organization for

Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Basic Linked System (BLS) developed by the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), and the Rural Urban North South (RUNS) model by the University of Brussels.

These world general equilibrium models provide a sophisticated treatment of the economic structure of groups of countries with similar characteristics. By contrast, country groups and single country models are able to capture the varying effects of macroeconomic and agricultural pricing policies in countries with different economic structures and policies.

Compared to partial equilibrium and other commodity and sectoral-based models, general equilibrium approaches can better capture the intersectoral and macroeconomic linkages. By considering income and intersectoral resource allocation effects, these general equilibrium models provide a more detailed analysis of the impacts of agricultural and trade policies. However, because of constraints on model size, the level of disaggregation may not be sufficient to represent each market completely. Finally, single country models provide the best means of capturing the full effects of domestic policy changes. An important feature is the ability of single country models to treat agricultural production in detail and model these relationships in world markets. By specifying the social structure, the distribution of gains and losses within the country is also better represented in a single country approach.

Examples of archetype CGE models are those developed by Loo and Tower (1989) and Sadoulet and de Janvry (1990), both of which focused on the impact of world agricultural trade liberalization on the developing countries as a

whole.

Sadoulet and de Janvry provided a comprehensive review of six country CGE models that have been used for agricultural policy analysis. They found that the results obtained with the CGE models were quite different from those derived from partial equilibrium and multimarket approaches. This was because the CGE models incorporate wage, employment, income, savings-investment, government expenditure, and trade effects, as well as structural rigidities in the product and factor markets. For instance, in a partial equilibrium setting, an exogenous output increase with flexible prices under an inelastic demand for food results in a falling output price, an increase in consumer surplus, and a small or non-increase in producer surplus. In contrast, in a CGE environment with inelastic supply, the employment creation effects may be negligible. Consequently, falling prices can depress nominal and real wages, thus, making rural consumers worse off.

### **Data Requirements**

The main data requirement of the CGE model is a social accounting matrix (SAM). The SAM is an extension of the input-output table. It forms part of the national accounting system laid out in the United Nations System of National Accounts (1968) framework which was developed largely by Stone (1961). The SAM is designed to capture, in addition to the product flows, the income and expenditure flows of the economic actors over a specified accounting period, usually a year, as in the national accounts. Hence the national accounts

statistics are used to reconcile the SAM aggregates. The product, factor, income and expenditure flows represent the equilibrium state of the economy which the CGE model seeks to replicate.

The only published SAM, for Malaysia is for the year 1970 (see Pyatt and Round, 1984). A 1978 SAM was constructed as part of two modeling projects in the Economic Planning Unit (EPU) of the Prime Minister's Department. With the assistance of private consultants, the EPU had prepared a 1983 SAM but unlike the 1978 SAM was not prepared to release it pending its publication in 1992 or 1993. Seeking the latest available data, a preliminary 1983 SAM was derived from the published 1983 input-output table, the 1970 and 1978 SAMs and other government data sources.

The 1983 input-output table (Department of Statistics, 1988a) and the National Accounts Statistics (Department of Statistics, 1988b) for 1983 are the principal sources for deriving a SAM that is consistent with the national accounts. To obtain detailed breakdown of the accounts, the 1970 and 1978 SAMs were used with supplemental data from the Fourth Malaysia Plan, Economic Report of the Ministry, the 1980 Census of Population and the 1981-83 Labor Force Survey.

The Malaysia SAM has 9 major accounts. The first two accounts, "Activity" and "Commodity", represent the functioning of the product and factor markets. The first account or "Activity" represents the producing sector or industry. The second account is "Commodity" which records the flow of goods and services, both domestic and imported, in the economy.

Accounts 3 to 7 (labor, capital, corporation, household and government) represent a mapping of the flow of funds in an economy. Their transactions are essentially "transfers" involving no real flows. The remaining accounts (consolidated capital and the rest-of-the-world (ROW)), except for ROW, reflects various transfer payments. These transfers from the column accounts are either voluntary such as savings, or involuntary, for example, tax payments. There is no flow from the row accounts since they do not involve physical flows.

#### **Malaysia CGE Model**

The CGE model incorporates the core neoclassical features of a well-functioning economy that is characterized by: (a) profit and utility maximization by rational producers and consumers; (b) clearing of competitive factor and product markets through price and quantity adjustments; and (c) Pareto-optimal resource allocation.

In the Malaysian CGE model, the economy is disaggregated into eight sectors. There are five primary factors of production (land, capital and three types of labor), three categories of households (rural, urban low wage, and urban high wage), and five institutional actors (households, corporations, government, capital account and rest-of-the-world) which serve as intermediaries in mapping factor income to household income. A schematic representation of this CGE model outlining the main real and financial flows, markets, and economic institutions is shown in Figure 1 .

Import prices are exogenous in the model. This is the "small country" assumption which implies that the country cannot influence world import prices since its relative import share to total world trade is very small. Effectively, this means that for the country to sell more in the world markets, it must lower the export price.

The eight production sectors are derived from a grouping of commodity classes found in the 1983 input-output tables. The sectoral breakdown reflects the sub-sectors in the agricultural sector and the other major sectors of the economy. The eight sectors and their component industries are shown in Table 2. They consist of three agricultural production sectors, two primary natural resources sectors, two manufacturing sectors distinguishing between food and non-food manufacturing, and the services sector. The three agricultural production sectors are food crops, export crops comprising rubber and palm oil, and livestock and dairy. The two primary sectors are forestry and mining/petroleum which are, respectively, renewable and non-renewable natural resources.

Production is based on constant returns to scale using the Cobb-Douglas production function with five factors of production for the agricultural sectors and four for the non-agricultural sectors. Intermediate inputs are assumed to have a Leontief specification since the fixed coefficients can be derived from the input-output table.

The supply side of the model shares a specification common to a large number of CGE models. A composite good, i.e., a domestic-export goods bundle,



is used to model the supply of and demand for the output of each sector. Basically, a CES transformation function uses the relative prices in the domestic and export markets to determine the quantities supplied to each market. This is the Armington specification commonly adopted in CGE trade models to reflect the imperfect substitutability between domestic and exported goods and the cross-hauling of goods observed in the real world.

The demand side has four components, namely, intermediate demand, consumption government purchases, and investment which includes stocks. Intermediate demand is based upon fixed input-output coefficients as commonly done in most input-output analysis and CGE modeling. Consumption embodies household expenditures whose functions are derived from utility maximization. Government real spending is exogenous in the sense that the government injects its demands into the economy. This is consistent with the government's active role in the economy as reflected in the five-year national development plans. Stocks or inventory demand are a fixed proportion of domestic output. Investment demand is derived from a capital composition matrix which translates investment demand by sector of destination into investment demand by sector of origin. However, in the model, the composition of investment is assumed to be the same as for final demand to reproduce the GDP breakdown in the national accounts.

The Malaysian CGE model is divided into five equation modules. The first module defines the price system. The second module describes production and total revenue paid out to factors of production. This is followed by a mapping of factor payments to institutional actors in the third module. The demand

system of the institutional actors is described in the next module, thus completing the circular flow of income. The final module describes the market clearing and macro "closure" equations which constitute the "system constraints" of the model economy.

An equilibrium condition exists for each market. In the product market, equilibrium is defined where supply of composite commodities equals demand. The equilibrating variables for this market are the sectoral prices and quantities. Factor market equilibrium occurs when total factor supply equals demand. Assuming fixed supplies of primary factors, the equilibrating variables are the average factor prices. In this model specification, the various labor categories, in response to wage differential changes, can freely migrate across sectors but not between categories. In the foreign exchange market, an equilibrium relationship is established between the exchange rate and the current account balance. Either variable can be endogenized in the model to serve as the equilibrating variable. The "neoclassical closure" is the savings-investment balance or when savings is equal to investment. Aggregate savings has four components: household savings, government savings, corporate savings and foreign savings. Only government savings is determined endogenously. The model is "savings-driven" whereby aggregate investment is determined by aggregate savings.

The equilibrating conditions for the three major macro balances are savings-investment, government budget and the trade balance. One of these equilibrium conditions can be eliminated by Walras' Law. As in most CGE models, the savings-investment balance is dropped.

The CGE model is implemented using the SAM database and a solution algorithm that can compute equilibrium prices and quantities. The General Algebraic Modeling System (GAMS) is used to implement the system of non-linear equations.<sup>5</sup> The GAMS package is widely used for implementing CGE models because of its ease of use and implementability on a wide variety of computers.

The model needs were calibrated to the 1983 base year data set. The calibration involves the input of elasticity values and the derivation of shift and share parameters for the production and aggregate functions. Ideally, such values should be based on econometric estimates.<sup>6</sup> Since they are not available for Malaysia, the elasticity values are based on those employed in the Cameroon model (see Deverajan, et. al., 1991) and two other CGE studies of the Malaysian economy (Khor, 1982; Wong, 1987). The Cameroon model used a sectoral classification closest to this Malaysian model. The values used for comparable sectors in the other two Malaysian models serve as checks to ensure that the elasticities adopted were representative.

The calibration of the shift and share parameters follows the standard CGE procedure of using the base year data to solve for the parameters. Once calibrated properly, the model should reproduce the benchmark data set.

### **Policy Experiments and Estimation Results**

Using the benchmark solution, the model is then used to examine two policy experiments. First, a decline in world prices for Malaysian agricultural primary commodity exports, a 15% decline in world prices for the export

agriculture sector is simulated in this experiment. As presented in the literature review, the real prices of rubber and palm oil have declined about 50% between 1960 and 1990. CGE models are appropriate for medium to long term analysis of structural change. Assuming an average medium period of eight years, the actual rate of decline between 1960 and 1990 amounts to about 15% per period. The second experiment involves the removal of agricultural export taxes. Agricultural export taxes are eliminated to examine the implications of removing the tax burden on the export agriculture sector.

Each experiment uses the flexible exchange rate and neoclassical ("savings-driven") closure rule as the reference.<sup>7</sup> Short run and long run versions of the model are generated based on the type of factor market closure. In the short run version, total labor supply is considered to be fixed but labor is sectorally mobile, while capital stocks and land are fixed. This set of assumptions is based on the premise that in the short term, land and capital stocks cannot be converted into other uses even though their relative profitability has changed. In the long run, total factor supplies are fixed but all factors are assumed to be sectorally mobile. This implies a complete adjustment of factor mix in the long term in response to market signals.

#### Commodity Export Price Decline Scenario

##### (a) Economy-wide effects

Model results from this external shock are shown in Table 3. Although the 15% decline in the prices of agricultural exports has a minimal impact on the Malaysia's GDP, it changes the agricultural terms of trade, thus affecting

income distribution. Real GDP shows increases of 0.4% in the short term and 3.3% in the long term. This increase is due to the increased level of output and exports in the other sectors as resources are attracted away from the declining export agriculture sector and respond positively to the exchange rate depreciation caused by adjustments in the foreign exchange account.

The agriculture export price decline also results in a 2.9% loss in the external terms of trade. Agricultural terms of trade declines by 4.7%. Rural household income decreases by 2.9%, as opposed to 1.7% and 1.8% declines experienced by the urban low wage and urban high wage groups, respectively.

(b) Sectoral effects

As expected, domestic output of export agriculture decreases by 2.6%, while agricultural exports contract by 4.6%. Consistent with the general equilibrium framework of analysis, output and trade in other sectors of the economy adjust to the decline in the export agriculture sector and the ensuing exchange rate adjustment (Figure 2). The currency depreciation encourages exports and discourages imports in the other sectors. Except for export agriculture, the export-import balance in other agricultural sectors improves more than in the non-agricultural sectors.

The decline in agricultural exports does not stimulate domestic demand. This is an indication of the low substitutability of agricultural export commodities for goods in the domestic markets. The long term impact on sectoral production is more pronounced. Export agriculture experiences a 33.8% output reduction compared with a 2.6% decline in the short run. The other

sectors expand between 3% to 41% compared to a range of 0.2% to 3.2% in the short term as they attract resources from the declining export agriculture sector (Figure 2). In the short run, domestic prices of the agricultural sectors generally decline while those in the non-agricultural sectors rise, as shown in Table 3 and Figure 2. These changes are manifested in the deterioration of the agricultural terms of trade as discussed earlier.

Sectoral changes in factor demand and prices are generally consistent with changes in the product markets. The decline in labor demand (rural labor - 12.2%, urban unskilled -16.4% and urban skilled -16.0%) in the export agricultural sector is consistent with lower output as well as a reduction in wage rates, which decline by 17.9%. The sharp labor cutback, in spite of a short term output decline of only 2.6% , suggests a high labor-capital ratio in the sector's factor utilization.

The large long term effect on labor demand (rural labor -32.1%, urban unskilled -40.3% and urban skilled -40.5%) in the export agriculture sector is a magnification of the short term impact. The reduced labor demand is consistent with the 17.9% reduction in labor wage rates in the short run and the 38.9% reduction in the long run. The forestry, petroleum, and manufacturing sectors are the major beneficiaries from the reduction in labor usage in the export agricultural sector.

#### Removal of Agricultural Export Taxes

##### (a) Economy-wide effects

The removal of agricultural export taxes increases the agricultural terms of trade by 2.2% in the short term and 0.7% in the long term (Table 4). However this policy does not affect the external terms of trade. There is currency appreciation of 1.7% and 1.6% in the short and long term exchange rates. This currency appreciation has an adverse impact on the trade balance which deteriorates by 40.7% and 55.2% in the short and long term simulation respectively. The removal of the export taxes reduces government revenue by 3.1% (4.6%) and government savings by 45.5% (65.5%) in the short (long) term. The improvement in the agricultural terms of trade has a positive impact on rural household income which increases by 1.4% compared to 0.9% for the urban household groups.

#### (b) Sectoral effects

The output of the agricultural export sector expands by 1.0% in the short run, while all other sectors contract because of reduced exports. The long term impact on output is more pronounced as illustrated in Figure 3. In the long run, output of the export agriculture sector increases by 8.4%, while the other sectors shrink. As expected, the removal of export taxes expands this sector's exports (1.7% and 10.6% respectively in the short run and long run).

Imports in all sectors rise expectedly with an appreciation in the exchange rate. The increases in imports vary between sectors with export agriculture exhibiting the largest increase of 5.2% (6.1%). Changes in domestic sectoral demand are very small in the short term although in the long term, export agriculture demand expands at the expense of all the other sectors.

The removal of the export taxes results in increases in domestic price, composite price and producer price (with magnitudes of 3.6%, 3.4% and 4.4% respectively) of export agricultural commodities. These price increases stem from the removal of export taxes which increase the price received by producers for exports. Consequently, more production is geared towards exports, thus increasing the pressure on the price of domestic goods.

The pattern in sectoral labor demand usually reflects changes in sectoral output. Labor demand in the export agriculture sector expands by 18.5% in the short term and 29.8% in the long term. These factor demand increases are consistent with the 1% and 8.4% increases in output, respectively. Corresponding to the reduced outputs in the other sectors, their labor demands also decline. The forestry, mining and manufacturing sectors experience relatively large reductions in labor demand, between 8-11%, while the food agriculture, food processing and services sectors are moderately or slightly affected.

A similar pattern of changes is found in the demand for capital and land. As shown in Table 4, the export agriculture sector expands at the expense of the other land-using sectors. In competing for land, export agriculture expands its land use by 4%, while the forestry, food agriculture and livestock sectors experience losses of 8.7%, 6.1% and 5.0% respectively.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

This research developed an eight-sector, single period, agricultural-focused CGE model of Malaysia, using 1983 as the base year. The model was then



used to analyze the comparative static effects of an external shock scenario and a domestic policy shift on the Malaysian economy, concentrating on changes in prices, production, trade, resource allocation and income.

The external shock, a 15% decline in agricultural commodity export prices, and the policy change of eliminating agricultural export taxes, have minimal effects on Malaysia's gross domestic product. This result demonstrates the growing resilience of the increasingly diversified Malaysian economy to external shocks. Also, it points to the domestic economy's ability to buffer internal policy-induced distortions.

For the elimination of agricultural export taxes, as expected, the export agriculture sector benefits. Its output increases by 1% in the short term and 8.4% in the long term. These gains are obtained at the expense of the other sectors.

The decline in agricultural commodity export prices has significant long term effects, especially on the export agriculture sector. The sector's output decreases by 2.6% in the short term and 33.8% in the long term. The corresponding effects on the sector's exports are a contraction of 4.6% in the short run and 43.3% in the long run. The other agricultural sectors benefit from the decline in export agriculture. Food agriculture registers a short term output increase of 1% and a long term increase of 7.2% while exports increase by 3.9% and 13.4% respectively. Output of the livestock and food processing sectors both increase by less than 1% in the short term and by 4.6% and 4% in the long term. Their exports also show short term increases of

3.7% and 5.7% respectively and 8.8% in the long term.

The CGE model has provided a quantification of the general equilibrium effects of an economic shock and a policy shift separately. The potential strength of this type of analysis lies in the intersectoral linkages that are incorporated in the supply-demand equilibrium in both the product and factor markets. The multisectoral and economy-wide approach is necessary for analyzing changes in policies and the macro environment. The micro foundations, that is, the incorporation of behavioral relationships based on economic theory and the use of data that are consistent with the national accounts, add to the strength of the CGE model as an experimental tool for economics. The research provided here can serve as a foundation for future work in regional modeling and analysis.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup>This trend is so commonly observed that the phenomenon qualifies as a stylized fact of modern economic development (Krueger, et al., 1988). However, it is a policy-based commonality. Hence, it is theoretically more easily reversible than tastes, technology, and other institutional factors accounting for structural transformation in the process of economic development.
- <sup>2</sup>Surveys of CGE applications include Shoven and Whalley (1984) on taxation and international trade, de Mello (1988) on trade policy analysis in developing countries, Deverajan (1988) on natural resources and taxation in developing countries and Decaluwe and Martens (1987) on various applications of 26 country models.
- <sup>3</sup>Dervis, de Melo and Robinson (1982) examined developing issues that include resource allocation, growth, structural change, foreign trade strategies, and the impact of different strategies on income distribution. In addition to these, there are numerous single and multi-country studies on issues covering the "Dutch Disease" phenomenon, trade and commercial policies and economic integration. See previous footnote for survey articles.
- <sup>4</sup>See the forthcoming proceedings on the IIASA's *Fifth Task Force Meeting on Applied General Equilibrium Modeling* held at Luxemburg, Austria, August 27-29, 1991.
- <sup>5</sup>An introduction to the GAMS modeling approach is given by Meeraus (1983). The GAMS package is described in Brooke, Kendrick, and Meeraus (1988). Condon, Dahl and Deverajan (1987) provide a detailed discussion of how to implement a CGE model on GAMS. An updated version is provided by Deverajan, Lewis and Robinson (1991).
- <sup>6</sup>Jorgenson and Wilcoxon (1990) employ econometric estimates of such parameters in an environmental issue-oriented CGE model of the U.S.
- <sup>7</sup>Because of space limitations, simulations with different market closures were not shown. However, these results can be provided in detail upon request to the authors.

Figure 1: A Schematic Representation of the CGE Model of Malaysia




Figure 2: Effects of Agricultural Export Price Decline on Sectoral Output and Trade





Figure 3: Effects of Removal of Agricultural Export Taxes on Output and Trade



**Table 1: GDP of Malaysia by Industry Origin (Constant Prices)**

Sector	Percent of GDP				
	1955	1965	1975	1985	1990
Agric., forestry & fishing	40.2	31.5	27.7	20.8	18.9
Mining, quarry, crude oil	6.3	9.0	4.6	10.5	9.7
Manufacturing	8.2	10.4	16.4	19.7	25.2
Construction	3.0	4.5	3.8	4.8	3.5
Services	42.3	44.6	47.5	44.2	42.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Notes: 1955 and 1965 figures are for Peninsular Malaysia only.  
Base year is 1960 for 1955 and 1965 figures and 1978 for the  
remaining years. 1990 figures are preliminary Central Bank of  
Malaysia estimates.

Source: Bank Negara Malaysia, Money and Banking in Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur,  
and Annual Report 1990, Kuala Lumpur, 1991.

**Table 2: Sectoral Disaggregation of the Malaysian Economy**

Sector	1983 IO Table grouping	Industry (commodities)
1. AGRIC: Food agriculture	1 OTH AGRIC	Coconut estates and smallholdings (coconut, tea, coffee, cocoa, and other food crops).
	6 FISHING	Meat preparation & dairy product manufacturing (meat & meat products, dairy products).
2. EXAGR: Export agriculture	2 RUBBER PLN	Rubber planting (unprocessed rubber, seeds and wood materials).
	3 OIL PALM	Oil palm estates (fresh fruit bunch, kernel and nuts for planting).
	10 OIL & FATS	Oils & fats processing (palm oil, coconut oil and other vegetable oils).
	26 RUBBER PRO	Rubber processing (processed latex, sheet rubber, block rubber, crepe rubber).
	27 RUBBER PRD	Rubber products industries (tyres, tubes, footwear).
3. LVSTK: Livestock & dairy	4 LIVESTOCK	Livestock farming (pigs, cattle, poultry & other livestock raising).
	8 DAIRY PROD	Dairy production.
4. FORES: Forest & forest industries	5 FORESTRY	Forestry and logging (products).
	19 SAWMILLS	Sawmilling & wood processing (sawmill, plywood, board & other wood products).
	20 FURN FIXT	Furniture industries (wooden furniture and fixtures).
	21 PAPER PRNT	Pulp, paper and printing industries (pulp & paper products, printing products).
5. FPROC: Food processing	9 VEG FRUIT	Canning & processing (canned & preserved fruits, vegetables and seafoods).
	11 GRAIN MILL	Grain mills (rice, flour, sago, tapioca & other grain mill products).
	12 BAKER CONF	Bakeries and confectionaries (bakery and confectionary products).
	13 OTH FOODS	Other food manufacturing (ice, sugar, coffee, tea, noodles and other food products).
	14 ANMAL FEED	Animal feed manufacturing (animal feeds).
	15 BEVERAGES	Beverages industries (alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages).
	16 TOBACCO	Tobacco industry (tobacco products).



Table 2: (Continued)

Sector	1983 IO Table grouping	Industry (commodities)
6. M+OIL: Mining & petroleum	7 MINING 25 PETROL PRD	Mining & quarrying (crude oil, natural gas, tin, iron, quarrying). Petroleum refineries (petrol, kerosene, LPG, bitumen, asphalt).
7. MANUF: Manuf-acturing	17 TEXTILES 18 WEARNG APL 22 INDST CHEM 23 PAINTS ETC 24 OT CHM PRD 28 PLSTIC PRD 29 GLASS PROD 30 CEMENT 31 N METALLIC 32 BASIC MTL 33 OTH METAL 34 N ELEC MAC 35 ELECT MACH 36 MOTOR VEH 37 OTH TRANSP 38 O MFG PROD	Textile manuf. (yarn, cloth & synthetic fabrics, rugs, ropes). Apparel & leather industries (clothing, apparels, leather products). Manuf. of industrial chemicals (chemicals, fertilizers & pesticides). Manufacture of paints, varnishes & lacquers. Manufacture of other chem. pdts (drugs, medicines, soap). Plastic industries (plastic products). Pottery, clay and glass manufacturing (ceramics & glass products). Cement manufacturing (cement, lime and plaster). Manuf. of non-metallic mineral products (concrete, plaster). Basic metal industries (iron & steel, tin, machines and equipment). Manuf. of fabricated metal products (tin cans, metal products). Manuf. of machinery except electrical (indus./agric. machinery). Electrical manuf. industries (electr. machinery, appliances). Motor vehicle manufacturing (vehicle bodies, assembly). Manuf. & assembly of motorcycles, ships, railroad & aircraft. Other manuf. (scientific equipment, photographic, jewellery).
8. SERVC: Services, constr. & utilities	39 ELECTRCITY 40 WATER 41 CNSTRCTION 42 TRADE 43 HOTEL ETC 44 TRANSPORT 45 COMMUNICAT 46 FINANCE 47 INSURANCE 48 DWELLINGS 49 BUSIN SERV 50 PRIV EDUC 51 PR HEALTH 52 CULT SERV 53 REPAIR VEH 54 PERSON SER 55 PUB ADMIN 56 GOV EDUC 57 GOV HEALTH 58 O GOV SERV 59 PRI NP SER 60 OTHER SERV	Electricity, gas & steam. Water. Construction. Wholesale and retail trade margins. Restaurants & hotel services. Land, water & air transport and related services. Communications (post and telecommunications). Financial institutes' services. Insurance. Real estate & ownership of dwellings. Legal, accounting, dataprocessing, advertising, etc. Private educational services. Private medical, dental and other health services. Cultural, media and entertainment services. Repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles. Personal and household services. General public administration. Government educational services. Gvoernment health services. Other government services. Private non-profit services (religious). Miscellaneous personal services.

Table 3: Economy-wide, Output and Trade Effects From a 15% Decline in Agricultural Export Prices

Variables	Base year value	Percentage change from base year value:	
		Short Run	Long Run
Economy-wide variables ('000 ringgit except for prices and terms of trade)			
Exchange rate	1.00	3.6	2.4
Domestic goods price	1.00	-1.6	-1.7
Composite goods price	1.00	0.0	-0.4
Real GDP	69,941	0.4	3.3
Balance of trade	1,639	3.7	58.7
External terms of trade	125	-2.9	0.1
Ag terms of trade	100	-4.7	-2.7
Aggregate savings	26,466	-0.1	5.0
Government revenue	19,590	0.2	5.5
Government savings	1,413	8.2	83.3
Rural household income	11,014	-2.9	-1.3
Urban low wage income	15,961	-1.7	2.4
Urban high wage income	15,961	-1.8	1.0
Domestic output ('000 ringgit)			
Food agriculture	5,018	1.0	7.2
Export agriculture	16,699	-2.6	-33.8
Livestock	4,346	0.2	4.6
Forestry	8,826	3.2	41.0
Food processing	6,737	0.5	4.0
Mining & petroleum	17,286	0.6	10.0
Manufacturing	24,174	1.7	4.4
Services	48,059	0.3	3.0
Export value ('000 ringgit)			
Food agriculture	452	3.9	13.4
Export agriculture	7,901	-4.6	-43.3
Livestock	91	3.7	8.7
Forestry	4,790	4.7	54.1
Food processing	601	5.7	8.7
Mining & petroleum	8,241	1.3	12.6
Manufacturing	8,829	3.2	5.8
Services	4,890	2.8	4.8
Import value ('000 ringgit)			
Food agriculture	1,535	-5.4	-5.9
Export agriculture	416	-11.0	-17.5
Livestock	676	-3.2	0.5
Forestry	1,020	-1.8	-1.3
Food processing	2,385	-5.3	-1.4
Mining & petroleum	5,816	-1.1	2.8
Manufacturing	31,087	-1.3	1.5
Services	0	-0.9	3.3

Table 3: (Continued)

Variables	Base year value	Percentage change from base year value:	
		Short Run	Long Run
Domestic prices			
Food agriculture	1.00	-1.6	-7.7
Export agriculture	1.00	-8.1	16.3
Livestock	1.00	-2.2	-4.1
Forestry	1.00	0.0	-20.1
Food processing	1.00	-1.0	-1.7
Mining & petroleum	1.00	2.3	-2.7
Manufacturing	1.00	0.4	-0.6
Services	1.00	-2.0	-1.5
Composite prices			
Food agriculture	1.00	-0.3	-5.3
Export agriculture	1.00	-7.6	15.6
Livestock	1.00	-1.4	-3.2
Forestry	1.00	0.7	-15.9
Food processing	1.00	0.2	-0.6
Mining & petroleum	1.00	2.8	-0.7
Manufacturing	1.00	2.5	1.4
Services	1.00	-2.0	-1.5
Producer prices			
Food agriculture	1.00	-1.2	-6.8
Export agriculture	1.00	-9.9	3.4
Livestock	1.00	-2.1	-4.0
Forestry	1.00	2.0	-7.3
Food processing	1.00	-0.6	-1.3
Mining & petroleum	1.00	2.9	-0.2
Manufacturing	1.00	1.6	0.5
Services	1.00	-1.4	-1.1
Capital stocks	( '000 ringgit)		
Food agriculture	6,826	0.0	-1.3
Export agriculture	23,531	0.0	-39.0
Livestock	3,678	0.0	-3.8
Forestry	8,017	0.0	32.4
Food processing	9,179	0.0	4.1
Mining & petroleum	23,130	0.0	9.9
Manufacturing	28,564	0.0	4.5
Services	139,684	0.0	2.0
Land	( '000 ha)		
Food agriculture	1,348	0.0	26.4
Export agriculture	3,224	0.0	-21.9
Livestock	100	0.0	23.2
Forestry	469	0.0	69.7

Table 3: (Continued)

Variables	Base year value	Percentage change from base year value	
		Short Run	Long Run
Rural labor	('000 workers)		
Food agriculture	650	6.2	9.9
Export agriculture	1,023	-12.2	-32.1
Livestock	54	2.5	7.2
Forestry	134	13.7	47.5
Food processing	21	6.3	16.0
Mining & petroleum	50	11.4	22.4
Manufacturing	108	9.5	16.4
Services	1,199	3.9	13.7
Urban unskilled labor	('000 workers)		
Food agriculture	61	1.2	-3.4
Export agriculture	74	-16.4	-40.3
Livestock	3	-2.4	-5.8
Forestry	76	8.3	29.7
Food processing	51	1.3	2.0
Mining & petroleum	33	6.1	7.6
Manufacturing	291	4.3	2.3
Services	993	-1.0	-0.1
Urban skilled labor	('000 workers)		
Food agriculture	4	1.6	-3.7
Export agriculture	18	-16.0	-40.5
Livestock	1	-2.0	-6.1
Forestry	24	8.7	29.2
Food processing	15	1.7	1.6
Mining & petroleum	12	6.6	7.3
Manufacturing	35	4.7	2.0
Services	341	-0.6	-0.4
Labor wage rate	(ringgit) Average for all categories of labor.		
Food agriculture	1,120	-0.7	-1.2
Export agriculture	1,159	-17.9	-38.9
Livestock	3,058	-4.2	-3.7
Forestry	5,424	6.2	32.6
Food processing	6,130	-0.6	4.3
Mining & petroleum	7,745	4.1	10.1
Manufacturing	5,805	2.3	4.7
Services	6,342	-2.8	2.2
Land rental rate	('000 ringgit per ha)		
Food agriculture	0.864	-0.7	-21.8
Export agriculture	0.851	-17.9	-21.8
Livestock	4.464	-4.2	-21.8
Forestry	1.888	6.2	-21.8

Table 3: (Continued)

Variables	Base year value	Percentage change from base year	
		Short Run	Long Run
Capital rental rate	(100 percent)		
Food agriculture	0.341	-0.7	0.1
Export agriculture	0.159	-17.9	0.1
Livestock	0.243	-4.2	0.1
Forestry	0.221	6.2	0.1
Food processing	0.159	-0.6	0.1
Mining & petroleum	0.338	4.1	0.1
Manufacturing	0.165	2.3	0.1
Services	0.061	-2.8	0.1

**Table 4: Economy-wide, Output and Trade Effects From The Removal of Agricultural Export Taxes**

Variables	Base year value	Percentage change from base year value	
		Short Run	Long Run
Economy-wide variables ('000 ringgit except for prices and terms of trade)			
Exchange rate	1.00	-1.7	-1.6
Domestic goods price	1.00	0.8	0.7
Composite goods price	1.00	0.0	0.0
Real GDP	69,941	-0.2	-1.0
Balance of trade	1,639	-40.7	-55.2
External terms of trade	125	0.0	-0.9
Ag terms of trade	100	2.2	0.7
Aggregate savings	26,466	-2.2	-3.8
Government revenue	19,590	-3.1	-4.6
Government savings	1,413	-45.5	-65.5
Rural household income	11,014	1.4	0.8
Urban low wage income	15,961	0.9	-0.2
Urban high wage income	15,961	0.9	0.0
Domestic output ('000 ringgit)			
Food agriculture	5,018	-0.4	-2.1
Export agriculture	16,699	1.0	8.4
Livestock	4,346	-0.1	-1.0
Forestry	8,826	-1.2	-4.3
Food processing	6,737	-0.2	-1.2
Mining & petroleum	17,286	-0.3	-5.0
Manufacturing	24,174	-0.8	-2.0
Services	48,059	-0.1	-0.8
Export value ('000 ringgit)			
Food agriculture	452	-1.8	-4.2
Export agriculture	7,901	1.7	10.6
Livestock	91	-1.7	-2.6
Forestry	4,790	-1.7	-5.5
Food processing	601	-2.7	-3.6
Mining & petroleum	8,241	-0.6	-6.7
Manufacturing	8,829	-1.5	-2.9
Services	4,890	-1.3	-1.8
Import value ('000 ringgit)			
Food agriculture	1,535	2.8	2.9
Export agriculture	416	5.2	6.1
Livestock	676	1.7	0.7
Forestry	1,020	1.1	1.3
Food processing	2,385	2.8	1.8
Mining & petroleum	5,816	0.6	-0.2
Manufacturing	31,087	0.7	0.0
Services	0	0.5	-0.7

Table 4: (Continued)

Variables	Base year value	Percentage change from base year value:	
		Short Run	Long Run
Domestic prices			
Food agriculture	1.0	0.8	2.4
Export agriculture	1.0	3.6	-1.9
Livestock	1.0	1.1	1.2
Forestry	1.0	0.1	3.2
Food processing	1.0	0.5	0.6
Mining & petroleum	1.0	-1.0	2.1
Manufacturing	1.0	-0.1	0.5
Services	1.0	1.0	0.6
Composite prices			
Food agriculture	1.0	0.1	1.4
Export agriculture	1.0	3.4	-1.9
Livestock	1.0	0.7	0.8
Forestry	1.0	-0.3	2.2
Food processing	1.0	-0.1	0.0
Mining & petroleum	1.0	-1.3	0.6
Manufacturing	1.0	-1.2	-0.9
Services	1.0	1.0	0.6
Producer prices			
Food agriculture	1.0	0.5	2.0
Export agriculture	1.0	4.4	0.2
Livestock	1.0	1.0	1.1
Forestry	1.0	-0.6	1.6
Food processing	1.0	0.3	0.4
Mining & petroleum	1.0	-1.4	0.4
Manufacturing	1.0	-0.7	-0.3
Services	1.0	0.7	0.4
Capital stocks	( '000 ringgit)		
Food agriculture	6,826	0.0	0.1
Export agriculture	23,531	0.0	10.8
Livestock	3,678	0.0	1.2
Forestry	8,017	0.0	-2.7
Food processing	9,179	0.0	-1.2
Mining & petroleum	23,130	0.0	-4.9
Manufacturing	28,564	0.0	-2.0
Services	139,684	0.0	-0.4
Land	( '000 ha)		
Food agriculture	1,348	0.0	-6.1
Export agriculture	3,224	0.0	4.0
Livestock	100	0.0	-5.0
Forestry	469	0.0	-8.7

Table 4: (Continued)

Variables	Base year value	Percentage change from base year value	
		Short Run	Long Run
Rural labor	('000 workers)		
Food agriculture	650	-2.6	-2.9
Export agriculture	1,023	4.8	7.5
Livestock	54	-0.9	-1.8
Forestry	134	-4.9	-5.6
Food processing	21	-2.5	-4.1
Mining & petroleum	50	-4.9	-7.7
Manufacturing	108	-3.9	-4.8
Services	1,199	-1.5	-3.3
Urban unskilled labor	('000 workers)		
Food agriculture	61	-0.6	0.4
Export agriculture	74	6.9	11.2
Livestock	3	1.1	1.5
Forestry	76	-3.0	-2.3
Food processing	51	-0.5	-0.8
Mining & petroleum	33	-2.9	-4.6
Manufacturing	291	-2.0	-1.6
Services	993	0.5	0.0
Urban skilled labor	('000 workers)		
Food agriculture	4	-0.8	0.4
Export agriculture	18	6.7	11.1
Livestock	1	0.9	1.5
Forestry	24	-3.2	-2.4
Food processing	15	-0.7	-0.8
Mining & petroleum	12	-3.1	-4.6
Manufacturing	35	-2.2	-1.6
Services	341	0.3	-0.1
Labor wage rate	(ringgit) Average for all categories of labor.		
Food agriculture	1,120	0.4	0.3
Export agriculture	1,159	8.0	11.0
Livestock	3,058	2.2	1.4
Forestry	5,424	-2.0	-2.5
Food processing	6,130	0.5	-1.0
Mining & petroleum	7,745	-2.0	-4.8
Manufacturing	5,805	-1.0	-1.8
Services	6,342	1.5	-0.2
Land rental rate	('000 ringgit per ha)		
Food agriculture	0.864	0.4	6.7
Export agriculture	0.851	8.0	6.7
Livestock	4.464	2.2	6.7
Forestry	1.888	-2.0	6.7



**Table 4: (Continued)**

Variables	Base year value	Percentage change from base year value	
		Short Run	Long Run
Capital rental rate	(100 percent)		
Food agriculture	0.341	0.4	0.2
Export agriculture	0.159	8.0	0.2
Livestock	0.243	2.2	0.2
Forestry	0.221	-2.0	0.2
Food processing	0.159	0.5	0.2
Mining & petroleum	0.338	-2.0	0.2
Manufacturing	0.165	-1.0	0.2
Services	0.061	1.5	0.2

## References

- Abdul Aziz Abdul Rahman. 1991. Impact of Pricing, Taxation, and Trade Policies on Malaysian Agriculture, Malaysian Institute of Economic Research Report No. 37.
- Adelman, I. and S. Robinson. 1978. Income Distribution Policy in Developing Countries: A Case Study of Korea, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bank Negara Malaysia. 1991. Annual Report 1990, Kuala Lumpur.
- Brooke, A., D. Kendrick and A. Meeraus . 1988. GAMS: A User's Guide, Redwood City, CA: The Scientific Press.
- Condon, T., H. Dahl and S. Deverajan. 1987. Implementing A Computable General Equilibrium Model on GAMS: The Cameroon Model, DRD Discussion Paper, Report No. DRD290, World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Decaluwe, B. and A. Martens. 1987. Developing Countries and General Equilibrium Models: A Review of the Empirical Literature, IDRC Report No. IDRC-MR155e, Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Center.
- Department of Statistics, Malaysia. 1988a. 1983 Input-Output Tables, Kuala Lumpur.
- Department of Statistics, Malaysia. 1988b. National Accounts Statistics 1983, Kuala Lumpur.
- Dervis, K., J. de Melo, and S. Robinson. 1982. General Equilibrium Models for Development Policy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deverajan, S. J. D. Lewis and S. Robinson. 1991. "From Stylized to Applied Models: Building Multisectoral CGE Models for Policy Analysis". Mimeo (June).
- Deverajan, S. 1988. "Natural Resources and Taxation in Computable General Equilibrium Models of Developing Countries," Journal of Policy Modeling, 10(4): 505-528.
- Go, D. 1988. Growth and Adjustment in the Philippines: A Dynamic General Equilibrium Analysis, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Goulder, L. and L. Summers. 1986. "Tax Policy, Asset Prices, and Growth in a General Equilibrium Analysis", Research Paper, Department of Economics, Harvard University (November).
- Johansen, L. 1960. A Multisectoral Study of Economic Growth, Amsterdam: North-Holland
- Jorgenson, D. W. and P. J. Wilcoxon. 1990. "Intertemporal General Equilibrium Modeling of U.S. Environmental Regulation", Journal of Policy Modeling, 12(4); 715-744.

Khor, H. E. 1982. Income Distribution and Unemployment in Malaysia: A Dual Economy CGE Model, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University.

Krueger, A. O., M. Schiff and A. Valdes. 1988. "Agricultural Incentives in Developing countries: Measuring the Effect of Sectoral and Economy-wide Policies", The World Bank Economic Review, 2(1): 255-271.

Loo, Thomas and E. Tower. 1989. "Agricultural Protectionism and the Less Developed Countries: The Relationship Between Agricultural Prices, Debt Servicing and the Need for Development Aid", in A. B. Stoeckel, D. Vincent and S. Cuthbertson (eds), Macroeconomic Consequences of Farm-Support Policies, Durham: Duke University Press.

Malaysia. 1981. Fourth Malaysia Plan 1981-1985, Kuala Lumpur: Government Printers.

Malaysia, Ministry of Finance. 1986. Economic Report 1986/87, Kuala Lumpur.

de Mello, J. 1988. "Computable General Equilibrium Models for Trade Policy Analysis in Developing Countries: A Survey", Journal of Policy Modeling, 10(4): 469-503.

Meeraus, A. 1983. "An Algebraic Approach to Modeling", Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 5: 81-108.

Pyatt, G. and J. I. Round . 1984. "Improving the Macroeconomic Data Base: A SAM for Malaysia, 1970", World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 646., Washington, D. C.

Robinson, S. 1989. "Multisector Models", in Chenery, H.B. and T. N. Srinivasan (eds), Handbook of Development Economics Volume II, Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Robinson S., M. Kilkenney, and K. Hanson. 1990. "The USDA/ERS Computable General Equilibrium Model of the United States", Staff Report # AGES 9049, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. (June).

Sadoulet, E. and A. de Janvry. 1990. "Growth and Welfare Effects of a GATT Agreement in Agriculture on the Low Income Countries: An Integrated Multimarket General Equilibrium Analysis", in Goldin, I. and O. Knudsen (eds), Agricultural Trade Liberalization: Implications for Developing Countries, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Shoven, J. B. and J. Whalley. 1984. "Applied General Equilibrium Models of Taxation and International Trade", Journal of Economic Literature 22(3): 1007-1051.

Stone, R. 1961. "Social Accounts at the Regional Level: A Survey", in W. Isard and W. H. Cumberland, eds. Regional Economic Planning: Techniques of Analysis, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Timmer, C. P. 1984. "Energy and Structural Change in the Asia-Pacific Region: The Agricultural Sector", in Bautista, R. and S. Naya (eds), Energy and Structural Change in Asia-Pacific Region: Papers and Proceedings. Manila: Philippine Institute for Development Studies and Asian Development Bank.

United Nations. 1968. A System of National Accounts, Series F. No. 2 Rev. 2.

Wilcoxon, P. J. 1986. "Investment with Foresight in General Equilibrium", Research Paper, Harvard University.

Wong, Yit Fan. 1987. Price Effects of a Windfall Gain in Malaysia. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawaii.

October 1, 1993

INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL TRADE RESEARCH CONSORTIUM\*

Working Papers Series

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author(s)</u>	<u>Send correspondence or requests for copies to:</u>
85-1	Do Macroeconomic Variables Affect the Ag Trade Sector? An Elasticities Analysis	McCalla, Alex Pick, Daniel	Dr Alex McCalla Dept of Ag Econ U of California Davis, CA 95616
86-1	Basic Economics of an Export Bonus Scheme	Houck, James	Dr James Houck Dept of Ag Econ U of Minnesota St Paul, MN 55108
86-2	Risk Aversion in a Dynamic Trading Game	Karp, Larry	Dr Larry Karp Dept of Ag & Resource Econ/U of California Berkeley, CA 94720
86-3	An Econometric Model of the European Economic Community's Wheat Sector	de Gorter, Harry Meilke, Karl	Dr Karl Meilke Dept of Ag Econ U of Guelph Guelph, Ontario CANADA N1J 1S1
86-4	Targeted Ag Export Subsidies and Social Welfare	Abbott, Philip Paarlberg, Philip Sharples, Jerry	Dr Philip Abbott Dept of Ag Econ Purdue University W Lafayette, IN 47907
86-5	Optimum Tariffs in a Distorted Economy: An Application to U.S. Agriculture	Karp, Larry Beghin, John	Dr Larry Karp Dept of Ag & Resource Econ/U of California Berkeley, CA 94720
87-1	Estimating Gains from Less Distorted Ag Trade	Sharples, Jerry	Dr Jerry Sharples USDA/ERS/IED/ETP 628f NYAVEBG 1301 New York Ave NW Washington, DC 20005-4788
87-2	Comparative Advantage, Competitive Advantage, and U.S. Agricultural Trade	White, Kelley	Dr Kelley White USDA/ERS/IED 732 NYAVEBG 1301 New York Ave NW Washington, DC 20005-4788

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author(s)</u>	<u>Send correspondence or requests for copies to:</u>
87-3	International Negotiations on Farm Support Levels: The Role of PSEs	Tangermann, Stefan Josling, Tim Pearson, Scott	Dr Tim Josling Food Research Institute Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305
87-4	The Effect of Protection and Exchange Rate Policies on Agricultural Trade: Implications for Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico	Krissoff, Barry Ballenger, Nicole	Dr Barry Krissoff USDA/ERS/ATAD 624 NYAVEBG 1301 New York Ave NW Washington, DC 20005-4788
87-5	Deficits and Agriculture: An Alternative Parable	Just, Richard Chambers, Robert	Dr Robert Chambers Dept of Ag & Resource Economics Univ of Maryland College Park, MD 20742
87-6	An Analysis of Canadian Demand for Imported Tomatoes: One Market or Many?	Darko-Mensah, Kwame Prentice, Barry	Dr Barry Prentice Dept of Ag Econ & Farm Mgmt University of Manitoba Winnipeg, Manitoba CANADA R3T 2N2
87-7	Japanese Beef Policy and GATT Negotiations: An Analysis of Reducing Assistance to Beef Producers	Wahl, Thomas Hayes, Dermot Williams, Gary	Dr Dermot Hayes Dept of Economics Meat Export Research Center Iowa State University Ames, IA 50011
87-8	Grain Markets and the United States: Trade Wars, Export Subsidies, and Price Rivalry	Houck, James	Dr James Houck Dept of Ag Econ Univ of Minnesota St Paul, MN 55108
87-9	Agricultural Trade Liberalization in a Multi-Sector World Model	Krissoff, Barry Ballenger, Nicole	Dr Barry Krissoff USDA/ERS/ATAD 624 NYAVEBG 1301 New York Ave NW Washington, DC 20005-4788
88-1	Developing Country Agriculture in the Uruguay Round: What the North Might Miss	Mabbs-Zeno, Carl Ballenger, Nicole	Dr Nicole Ballenger USDA/ERS/ATAD 624 NYAVEBG 1301 New York Ave NW Washington, DC 20005-4788

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author(s)</u>	<u>Send correspondence or requests for copies to:</u>
88-2	Two-Stage Agricultural Import Demand Models Theory and Applications	Carter, Colin Green, Richard Pick, Daniel	Dr Colin Carter Dept of Ag Economics Univ of California Davis, CA 95616
88-3	Determinants of U.S. Wheat Producer Support Price: A Time Series Analysis	von Witzke, Harald	Dr Harald von Witzke Dept of Ag Economics Univ of Minnesota St Paul, MN 55108
88-4	Effect of Sugar Price Policy on U.S. Imports of Processed Sugar-containing Foods	Jabara, Cathy	Dr Cathy Jabara Office of Econ Policy U.S. Treasury Dept 15th & Pennsylvania Ave NW Washington, DC 20220
88-5	Market Effects of In-Kind Subsidies	Houck, James	Dr James Houck Dept of Ag Economics University of Minnesota St Paul, MN 55108
88-6	A Comparison of Tariffs and Quotas in a Strategic Setting	Karp, Larry	Dr Larry Karp Dept of Ag & Resource Econ/U of California Berkeley, CA 94720
88-7	Targeted and Global Export Subsidies and Welfare Impacts	Bohman, Mary Carter, Colin Dortman, Jeffrey	Dr Colin Carter Dept of Ag Economics U of California, Davis Davis, CA 95616
89-1	Who Determines Farm Programs? Agribusiness and the Making of Farm Policy	Alston, Julian Carter, Colin Wholgenant, M.	Dr Colin Carter Dept of Ag Economics U of California, Davis Davis, CA 95616
89-2	Report of ESCOP Subcommittee on Domestic and International Markets and Policy	Abbott, P.C. Johnson, D.G. Johnson, R.S. Meyers, W.H. Rossmiller, G.E. White, T.K. McCalla, A.F.	Dr Alex McCalla Dept of Ag Economics U of California-Davis Davis, CA 95616
89-3	Does Arbitraging Matter? Spatial Trade Models and Discriminatory Trade Policies	Anania, Giovanni McCalla, Alex	Dr Alex McCalla Dept of Ag Economics U of California-Davis Davis, CA 95616

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author(s)</u>	<u>Send correspondence or requests for copies to:</u>
89-4	Export Supply and Import Demand Elasticities in the Japanese Textile Industry: A Production Theory Approach	Pick, Daniel Park, Timothy	Daniel Pick USDA/ERS/ATAD 1301 New York Ave. N.W. Washington, DC 20005-4788
89-5	The Welfare Effects of Imperfect Harmonization of Trade and Industrial Policy	Gatsios, K. Karp, Larry	Dr. Larry Karp Dept. of Ag & Resource Econ/U of California Berkeley, CA 94720
89-6	Report of the Task Force on Tariffication and Rebalancing	Josling, Tim Chair	Dr. Timothy Josling Food Research Institute Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305-6084
89-7	Report of the Task Force on Reinstrumentation of Agricultural Policies	Magiera, Stephen Chair	Stephen L. Magiera USDA/ERS/ATAD 1301 New York Ave., Rm 624 Washington, D.C. 20005-4788
89-8	Report of the Task Force on The Aggregate Measure of Support: Potential Use by GATT for Agriculture	Rossmiller, G.E. Chair	Dr. G. Edward Rossmiller Resources for the Future Nat'l Ctr for Food/Ag Policy 1616 P Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036
89-9	Agricultural Policy Adjustments in East Asia: The Korean Rice Economy	Kwon, Yong Dae Yamauchi, Hiroshi	Dr. Hiroshi Yamauchi Dept. of Ag & Res. Econ. University of Hawaii 3050 Maile Way Gilmore Hall Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
90-1	Background Papers for Report of the Task Force on The Aggregate Measure of Support: Potential Use by GATT for Agriculture	Rossmiller, G.E. Chair	Dr. G. Edward Rossmiller Resources for the Future Nat'l Ctr for Food/Ag Policy 1616 P Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036
90-2	Optimal Trade Policies for a Developing Country Under Uncertainty	Choi, E. Kwan Lapan, Harvey E.	Dr. E. Kwan Choi Dept. of Economics Iowa State University Ames, Iowa 50011
90-3	Report of the Task Force on The Comprehensive Proposals for Negotiations in Agriculture	Josling, Tim Chair	Dr. Timothy Josling Food Research Institute Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305-6084



<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author(s)</u>	<u>Send correspondence or requests for copies to:</u>
90-4	Uncertainty, Price Stabilization & Welfare	Choi, E. Ewan Johnson, Stanley	Dr. E. Kwan Choi Dept. of Economics Iowa State University Ames, IA 50011
90-5	Politically Acceptable Trade Compromises Between The EC and The US: A Game Theory Approach	Johnson, Martin Mahe, Louis Roe, Terry	Dr. Terry Roe Dept. of Ag & Applied Econ 1994 Buford Avenue University of Minnesota St. Paul, MN 55108
90-6	Agricultural Policies and the GATT: Reconciling Protection, Support and Distortion	de Gorter, Harry Harvey, David R.	Dr. Harry de Gorter Dept. of Ag Economics Cornell University Ithaca, NY 14853
91-1	Report of the Task Force on Reviving the GATT Negotiations in Agriculture	Trade Update Notes	Dr. Maury E. Bredahl Center for International Trade Expansion 200 Mumford Hall Missouri University Columbia, MO 65211
91-2	Economic Impacts of the U.S. Honey Support Program on the Canadian Honey Trade and Producer Prices	Prentice, Barry Darko, Kwame	Dr. Barry E. Prentice University of Manitoba Dept of Ag Economics & Farm Management Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2 CANADA
91-3	U.S. Export Subsidies in Wheat: Strategic Trade Policy or an Expensive Beggar-My-Neighbor Tactic?	Anania, Giovanni Bohman, Mary Colin, Carter A.	Dr. Colin Carter Dept of Ag Economics Univ. California-Davis Davis, CA 95616
91-4	The Impact of Real Exchange Rate Misalignment and Instability on Macroeconomic Performance in Sub-Saharan Africa	Ghura, Dhaneshwar Grennes, Thomas J.	Dr. Thomas J. Grennes Dept of Economics & Business North Carolina State Univ P.O. Box 8109 Raleigh, NC 27695-8109
91-5	Global Grain Stocks and World Market Stability Revisited	Martinez, Steve Sharples, Jerry	Steve Martinez USDA/ERS/ATAD 1301 New York Ave NW Room 624 Washington, DC 20005-4788

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author(s)</u>	<u>Send correspondence or requests for copies to:</u>
91-6	The Export Enhancement Program: Prospects Under the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990	Haley, Stephen L.	Dr. Stephen L. Haley Dept of Ag Economics & Agribusiness Louisiana State University 101 Ag Admin Bldg Baton Rouge, LA 70803-5604
91-7	European Economic Integration and the Consequences for U.S. Agriculture	Gleckler, James Koopman, Bob Tweeten, Luther	Luther Tweeten Dept of Ag Economics & Rural Sociology Ohio State University 2120 Fyffe Road Columbus, OH 43210-1099
91-8	Agricultural Policymaking in Germany: Implications for the German Position in Multilateral Trade Negotiations	Tangermann, Stefan Kelch, David	David Kelch ATAD/ERS/USDA 1301 New York Ave NW-624 Washington, DC 20005-4788
91-9	Partial Reform of World Rice Trade: Implications for the U.S. Rice Sector	Haley, Stephen	Stephen L. Haley Dept of Ag Economics & Agribusiness Louisiana State University 101 Ag Administration Bldg Baton Rouge, LA 70803
91-10	A Simple Measure for Agricultural Trade Distortion	Roningen, Vernon Dixit, Praveen M.	Vernon O. Roningen ATAD/ERS/USDA 1301 New York Ave NW-624 Washington, DC 20005-4788
92-1	Estimated Impacts of a Potential U.S.-Mexico Preferential Trading Agreement for the Agricultural Sector	Krissoff, Barry Neff, Liana Sharples, Jerry	Barry Krissoff ATAD/ERS/USDA 1301 New York Ave NW-734 Washington, DC 20005-4788
92-2	Assessing Model Assumptions in Trade Liberalization Modeling: An Application to SWOMPSIM	Herlihy, Micheal Haley, Stephen L. Johnston, Brian	Stephen Haley Louisiana State University Dept AgEc & Agribusiness 101 Administration Bldg Baton Rouge, LA 70803
92-3	Whither European Community Common Agricultural Policy, MacSharried, or Dunkeled in the GATT?	Roningen, Vernon	Vernon O. Roningen ATAD/ERS/USDA 1301 New York Ave NW-624 Washington, DC 20005-4788

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author(s)</u>	<u>Send correspondence or requests for copies to:</u>
92-4	A Critique of Computable General Equilibrium Models for Trade Policy Analysis	Hazledine, Tim	Tim Hazledine Bureau of Competition Policy - 20th Floor Economic & Intl Affairs Place du Portage I 50 Victoria Street Hull, Quebec CANADA K1A 0C9
92-5	Agricultural Trade Liberalization: Implications for Productive Factors in the U.S.	Liapis, Peter Shane, Mathew	Peter S. Liapis USDA/ERS/ATAD 1301 New York Ave NW-624 Washington, DC 20005-4788
92-6	Implementing a New Trade Paradigm: Opportunities for Agricultural Trade Regionalism in the Pacific Rim	Tweeten, Luther Lin, Chin-Zen Gleckler, James Rask, Norman	Luther Tweeten Ohio State University Dept of Ag Economics 2120 Fyffe Rd Columbus, OH 43210-1099
92-7	The Treatment of National Agricultural Policies in Free Trade Areas	Josling, Tim	Tim Josling Stanford University Food Research Institute Stanford, CA 94305
92-8	Shifts in Eastern German Production Structure Under Market Forces	Paarlberg, Philip	Philip L. Paarlberg Purdue University Dept of Ag Economics Krannert Bldg West Lafayette, IN 47907
92-9	The Evolving Farm Structure in Eastern Germany	Paarlberg, Philip	Philip L. Paarlberg Purdue University Dept of Ag Economics Krannert Bldg West Lafayette, IN 47907
92-10	MacSherry or Dunkel: Which Plan Reforms the CAP?	Josling, Tim Tangermann, Stefan	Tim Josling Stanford University Food Research Institute Stanford, CA 94305
93-1	Agricultural and Trade Deregulation in New Zealand: Lessons for Europe and the CAP	Gibson, Jim Hillman, Jimmie Josling, Timothy Lattimore, Ralph Stumme, Dorothy	Jimmie Hillman University of Arizona Dept of Ag Economics Tucson, AZ 85721
93-2	Testing Dynamic Specification for Import Demand Models: The Case of Cotton	Arnade, Carlos Pick, Daniel Vasavada, Utpal	Dr. Daniel Pick USDA/ERS/ATAD 1301 New York Ave NW-#734 Washington, DC 20005-4788

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author(s)</u>	<u>Send correspondence or requests for copies to:</u>
93-3	Environmental & Agricultural Policy Linkages in the European Community: The Nitrate Problem and Cap Reform	Haley, Stephen	Stephen L. Haley USDA/ERS/ATAD 1301 New York Ave NW-#740 Washington, DC 20005-4788
93-4	International Trade in Forest Products: An Overview	Puttock, G. David Sabourin, Marc Meilke, Karl D.	David Puttock Faculty of Forestry University of Toronto 33 Willcocks St Toronto, Ontario CANADA M5S 3B3
93-5	Measuring Protection in Agriculture: The Producer Subsidy Equivalent Revisited	Masters, William	William A. Masters Purdue University Dept of Ag Economics West Lafayette, IN 47907
93-6	Phasing In and Phasing Out Protectionism with Costly Adjustment of Labour	Karp, Larry Thierry, Paul	Larry Karp Univ of Calif-Berkeley Ag and Resource Economics Berkeley, CA 94720
93-7	Domestic and Trade Policy for Central and East European Agriculture	Karp, Larry Spiro, Stefanou	Larry Karp Univ of Calif-Berkeley Ag and Resource Economics Berkeley, CA 94720
93-8	Evaluation of External Market Effects & Government Intervention in Malaysia's Agricultural Sector: A Computable General Equilibrium Framework	Yeah, Kim Leng Yanagida, John Yamauchi, Hiroshi	Hiroshi Yamauchi University of Hawaii Dept of Ag & Resource Econ 3050 Maile Way-Gilmore 104 Honolulu, HI 96822
93-9	Wheat Cleaning & Its Effect on U.S. Wheat Exports	Haley, Stephen L. Leetmaa, Susan Webb, Alan	Stephen L. Haley USDA/ERS/ATAD 1301 New York Ave NW-#740 Washington, DC 20005-4788

\*The International Agricultural Trade Research Consortium is an informal association of university and government economists interested in agricultural trade. Its purpose is to foster interaction, improve research capacity and to focus on relevant trade policy issues. It is financed by the USDA, ERS and FAS, Agriculture Canada and the participating institutions.

The IATRC Working Paper Series provides members an opportunity to circulate their work at the advanced draft stage through limited distribution within the research and analysis community. The IATRC takes no political positions or responsibility for the accuracy of the data or validity of the conclusions presented by working paper authors. Further, policy recommendations and opinions expressed by the authors do not necessarily reflect those of the IATRC.

Correspondence or requests for copies of working papers should be addressed to the authors at the addresses listed above.

A current list of IATRC publications is available from:

Laura Bipes, Administrative Director  
Department of Agricultural & Applied Economics  
University of Minnesota  
231g Classroom Office Building  
1994 Buford Ave  
St. Paul, MN 55108-6040  
U.S.A.