



**The Australian National University**  
**Centre for Economic Policy Research**  
***DISCUSSION PAPER***

**Living Standards, Terms of Trade and Foreign  
Ownership: Reflections on the Australian Mining  
Boom**

R. G. Gregory

DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 656

December 2011

ISSN: 1442-8636

ISBN: 978-1-921693-37-3

---

# **Living Standards, Terms of Trade and Foreign Ownership: Reflections on the Australian Mining Boom**

**R G Gregory<sup>1</sup>**

## **Abstract**

Australia is experiencing its largest mining boom for more than a century and a half. This paper explores, from a national perspective, important economic differences that arise when a mining boom, such as the current one, is generated by sustained export price increases (trading gains) rather than export volume increases. Since 2003 the terms of trade changes – through their direct trading gain effect and indirect real GDP effects - have increased Australian living standards. The increase, measured from official data and relative to the US, is about 25 per cent; an increase which probably places Australian living standards well above those of the US. But official data inadequately adjusts for foreign ownership of mining resources suggesting that this estimate is probably a little too high.

JEL Classification: Q33, O11, E01, O47, C43

Keyword: resource booms, terms of trade, real GDP, foreign ownership, economic growth

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor Emeritus, Research School of Economics, College of Business and Economics, Australian National University, Professorial Fellow, Centre for Strategic Economic Studies, Victoria University and Adjunct Professor, School of Economics and Finance, Queensland University of Technology. E-mail: bob.gregory@anu.edu.au

Much of this work has been undertaken with Professor Sheehan at Victoria University, Melbourne. I have benefited from presentations at Columbia University and the University of Wisconsin. I have had wide ranging discussions with Rob Bray, Peter Sheehan, Tue Gorgens, Quentin Grafton and Bob Haveman. These good friends have helped a great deal. The ABS has also been very helpful and a referee did a first class job in providing comments. An early version was prepared for the Feb. 2011 Conference “Resource Boom; Understanding the National and Regional Implications” at Victoria University, Melbourne.

# I

## *Introduction*

I was extremely pleased to be invited to contribute reflections on the current mining boom on the 35<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the publication of “Some Implications of the Development of the Mining Sector” (the mineral paper) in the Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 1976. The mineral paper provided the dominant intellectual framework for analyzing resource reallocation and exchange rate implications of the 1970s mineral boom and led to the subsequent development of the Dutch Disease literature (Gregory, 1976).

The mineral paper, responding to the 1970s economic environment, was designed with two purposes in mind. One purpose was to increase understanding of the potential effects of two policy instruments that had not generally been used in Australia - a large across-the-board tariff cut and changes in the nominal exchange rate.<sup>2</sup> The other purpose was to increase understanding of the relationship between the development of the new mineral export sector during the 1960s and 1970s and the large structural breaks that were occurring in the Australian economy. The structural breaks were mainly evident in large falls in the male full-time employment-population ratio that continued for the next two decades.

The new mineral export sector was generating significant changes in the price ratio of traded to non-traded goods and, in this way, crowding out old export industries, primarily rural products, and industries which competed with imports, primarily manufacturing.<sup>3</sup> A sectoral resource competition - real exchange rate framework of the mineral paper is now reasonably well understood so these reflections will focus more on

---

<sup>2</sup> It must be difficult for those who were not part of the policy discussions during the mid 1970s to understand the extent of disagreement as to what was taking place in the economy and disagreement as to the proper role of these two policy instruments. It may seem inconceivable now but at that time the Australian Treasury opposed both an across-the board-tariff cut and a system of flexible exchange rates, being firmly of the view that a fixed exchange rate was necessary to impose fiscal discipline on government. For a flavor of the debate surrounding tariff cuts, see Gruen (1975).

<sup>3</sup> Much of the discussion was focused on the import competing manufacturing sector. At 1970, manufacturing employment was 20 per cent of all employment. Today, that proportion is 9 per cent.

an issue which is less well understood and, to my mind, is the defining characteristic of the current mining boom.<sup>4</sup>

This boom is different from that analyzed in the 1976 paper.<sup>5</sup> At this point, the current mining boom is being driven, overwhelmingly, by sustained export *price* changes and not by export *volume* growth generated by new discoveries. The new analytical issue, therefore, revolves around whether it matters whether a mineral boom is being generated by *price* or *volume* changes? These reflections argue that it matters a great deal. Large and sustained increases in export prices raise a range of new analytical questions which give rise to exciting new research agendas. The issues we focus on are how to measure living standard changes in response to these price increases and the relevance of this measurement for interpreting the changes that are occurring in the Australian economy.

These reflections are arranged as follows. Part *II* sets the scene and documents the relative contributions of prices and volumes to the new mineral export boom. It then discusses how to measure the impact of mineral prices on average living standards and applies the measurement formula to Australian data. The mining impact is so large that the living standard increase is placed in an international context and Australian outcomes compared with those of the US. The results of the comparison are spectacular and indicate that Australian average living standards now exceed those of the US. Part *III* explores in more detail the nature of the living standard calculations, develops the analysis a little more and begins to map out new research agendas. It explores who receives the living standard increases, the importance of foreign ownership of the mining

---

<sup>4</sup> The mineral paper lead to wide ranging contributions to the mineral boom literature by Australian economists including Blundell-Wignall and Gregory (1990), Corden (1984), Forsyth (Forsyth and Kay (1981), Maddock and McLean (1983), Long (1983), Snape (1977), Stoeckel (1979), Warr (2006) and Shann (1983). Forsyth's association with the Institute of Fiscal Studies was an important early channel for the ideas to travel to the UK. The IFS invited me to give presentations and introduce the mineral paper ideas to officials from the UK Treasury, Bank of England and to academics. Subsequently, Corden and Neary (1982) added to and more firmly established these ideas in the international academic literature. They adopted the term "Dutch Disease" from a Nov 26<sup>th</sup> 1977 Economist article rather than the colonial "Gregory Thesis", a term originally applied by the Australian newspaper and C. Hurford, the Member of Parliament from Adelaide, South Australia.

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed analysis of different outcomes of the two mining booms see Gruen (2006) and Gruen (2011).

sector and conjectures what might happen if export prices and the terms of trade return to their long run trend values. Part *IV* offers concluding comments.

## *II*

### *Terms of Trade, Trading Gains and Australian Living Standards*

In the Australian international trade model, pioneered by Wilson (1931) and Swan (1960) and developed further by Salter (1959), Corden (1960) and Gregory (1976), there are three goods; exports, imports and non-internationally traded home goods. The model becomes analytically powerful when the terms of trade - the price of exports relative to the price of imports - are fixed. The model can then be reduced to two goods and two prices, non-traded goods and traded goods (exports and imports can be aggregated using their fixed price relativity). The price ratio of traded to non-traded goods is referred to as the real exchange rate.

The mineral paper was firmly within this tradition and assumed fixed terms of trade. But the data indicate that a fixed terms of trade model is not sufficient today. Figure 1, for example, plots prices for two important mineral export groups - Basic Metals and Other Resources. Beginning from 2003, the price increases are extraordinary and of the order of 250 to 350 per cent. The large price increases, for a significant share of exports, convert into large terms of trade changes.

Australian terms of trade always improve during world economic booms - 1972-73, 1988-89 - but the increases are relatively short lived and last less than three years (Figure 2). This mineral boom is quite different. The terms of trade upswing is three times larger than any upswing over the last fifty years, the increase is longer lasting - the increases have extended over a decade - and the terms of trade, fueled by fast growth in India and China, have remained high even though the developed world is in recession.

Such large and sudden shifts in the terms of trade, and such persistence at high levels, suggests that the analytical emphasis should be placed on export price increases and not increases in export volumes. A fixed terms of trade model applied to the current

mining boom is clearly inadequate. To emphasize this point, Figure 3 plots the total export/GDP volume ratio set at unity in 1959. These data show a constancy of the export/GDP share during the 1970s, a fairly strong increase during the 1980s and early 1990s and then, somewhat surprisingly, near constancy in this ratio for the last two decades. The other noticeable feature of Figure 3, which we will discuss further, is the rapid rise in import volumes as a share of GDP. Since the terms of trade began to increase from 2003 the import/GDP volume ratio increased 50 per cent and the export/GDP volume ratio fell marginally. To this point, export price increases have had their largest impact on import volumes and little impact on export volumes. There is no mining export volume boom of sufficient magnitude to change the total export/GDP volume ratio.

### ***Measurement Mechanics: The Income Effect of Terms of Trade Increases***

It has been well known among Australian policy analysts, at least since the Korean War boom, that large increases in the terms of trade can generate large real income gains.<sup>6</sup> What is not well known is how to measure real income changes in response to terms of trade changes (direct price income effects) and how these direct price income effects relate to changes in real income from RGDP responses (the indirect volume effects).

The key analytical issue arises as follows. Most macro growth analysis relies on real gross domestic product (RGDP) as a measure of a nation's real income. But RGDP is not a complete or adequate measure of real income when there are large changes in the terms of trade. RGDP attempts to measure the *volume* of goods and services produced and, by construction, does *not* attempt to measure real income that arise directly from a change in the *price* of imports or exports. Hence, the usefulness of RGDP as a living standard measure during a mineral boom will depend on whether the additional income

---

<sup>6</sup> The very large, but temporary increases in the Australian terms of trade in response to the Korean War boom, and the associated large increase in national income, helped to provide impetus to the development of the Australian international trade model based on the traded non-traded goods dichotomy - Salter (1959), Swan (1960) and Gregory (1976). But surprisingly, these models invariably assume fixed terms of trade when the Korean War boom was an export price and terms of trade change phenomenon. It should also be noted that the major income loss from the depression of the 1930's was from the terms of trade fall rather than from an output loss, Gregory (1988).

from the mineral boom is being generated by an increase in export volumes, measured by RGDP, or an increase in export *prices*, not measured by RGDP.

The inadequacy of RGDP can be illustrated by the following example. Suppose export prices double but all other prices and real outputs in the economy are unchanged. In this example, current price GDP increases only because export prices increase. To measure RGDP, national account statisticians deflate each component of current price GDP by its own price deflator to calculate the underlying volume. When the higher export value is deflated by the higher export price this will indicate correctly that the export volume and RGDP have not changed. But, an export price increase, *ceteris paribus*, has increased real income.<sup>7</sup> A country must be better off when export sales double in price.

How should this increase in real income, generated by an export price increase, be measured? The usual response can be simply illustrated as follows.<sup>8</sup> Expenditure estimates of current price GDP can be written as

$$GDP = D - M + X \quad (1)$$

where  $D$  is current price total domestic final expenditure,  $M$  is the current price value of imports and  $X$  is the current price value of exports. To produce an estimate of RGDP each item on the right hand side of (1) is divided by its own price deflator.

To account for the income effect flowing from a terms of trade change the usual response is to deflate  $X$  and  $M$  not by their price deflators but by a common price deflator that will reflect the extra expenditure opportunities (the living standard increase) brought about by the export price increase. Hence, a new concept, real gross domestic income (RGDI) is defined as

$$RGDI = RGDP - (X / P_x - M / P_m) + (X - M) / P^* \quad (2)$$

The RGDI calculation therefore involves removing from RGDP the value of exports and imports, deflated by their own price deflators  $P_x$  and  $P_m$  - the second term on the right hand side of (2) - and replacing them by volume measures of exports and imports calculated by the application of a different deflator,  $P^*$ .

---

<sup>7</sup> When the terms of trade change, real GDP calculated by the income or expenditure path will no longer equal real GDP calculated from the production path.

<sup>8</sup> The precise definition applied by the ABS can be found at ABS (2004).

The difference between these two sets of import and export “volume” measures, the second and third term of (2), is referred to as a “trading gain” which can be written as

$$x\left(\frac{P_x}{P^*} - 1\right) - m\left(\frac{P_m}{P^*} - 1\right) \quad (3)$$

where  $x$  and  $m$  are export and import volumes, calculated by application of their own deflators. Trading gains arise therefore from relative price changes among exports, imports, and the price deflator  $P^*$  and the weights,  $x$  and  $m$  provided by export and import volumes calculated from their own deflators. If there is no change in any of these price relativities, between one period and the next, there is no price generated trading gain in that period. Under these circumstances, the change in RGDI is equal to the change in RGDP.

What deflator  $P^*$  should be chosen to measure the trading gain? There is no universally accepted answer to this question, although it has been posed for almost a century (Taussig (1927), Dorrance (1948-1949), Nicholson (1960), Silver and Mahdavy (1989), Diewert and Morrison (1986), UN (1968) and UN (2008)). Perhaps the reason for the lack of an accepted answer is that there is no correct response? While it seems straightforward that the extra export revenue generated by higher export prices should be deflated by the price index of the use to which the extra revenue will be put there is no way of knowing exactly what this use might be or when it might occur. So the only thing to do is to make a reasonable assumption and proceed on this basis. There are two potential price deflators with wide support.<sup>9</sup>

Academics, with an index number focus, are increasingly recommending that  $P^*$  be measured by the final domestic expenditure deflator. They argue that domestic expenditure (consumption) is the purpose of economic activity and the right living standard measure. They also argue that this deflator better captures all relative price shifts that are occurring in the economy (Diewert and Morrison (1986), Kohli (2004),

---

<sup>9</sup> As might be expected, official statisticians have been uncomfortable with a concept as amorphous as RGDI. But, even so, it is difficult to comprehend how controversial RGDI and the choice of deflator have been. The UN in their publication, *The System of National Accounts (SNA)*, (UN 1968, 1978), recommended that a terms of trade adjustment not be included in official statistical publications (Silver and Mahdavy 1989). But the UN has been slowly changing its position and the 2008 SNA publication suggests that the official statistical bureaus should account for terms of trade changes but offers no single recommendation as to how this should be done (see Kohli (2004), ABS (2001), SNA (2008), Silver and Mahdavy (1989)).



Macdonald (2010), Reinsdorf (2010), Feenstra, Heston, Timmer and Deng (2009). This deflator opens up many avenues for analysis – the role of each of the three price deflators,  $P_x$ ,  $P_m$  and  $P^*$ , and the role of the export and import weights. But with this analytical richness comes complexity.<sup>10</sup>

Official statistical agencies<sup>11</sup>, however, usually adopt a simpler approach and choose the import price deflator as  $P^*$  which, upon substitution into equation (3), simplifies the trading gains to

$$x\left(\frac{P_x}{P_m} - 1\right) \quad (4)$$

This calculation effectively adopts an import volume metric for the trading gains.

One argument underpinning the choice of  $P_m$  as a deflator is that from a nation's viewpoint the purpose of exports is to provide foreign currency to buy imports, hence the use of an import metric (Nicholson (1960)). Furthermore, if the economy is operating at full capacity, and keeping export production fixed, additional imports is the only margin available for increased resources in the short run. This phenomenon is evident in the rapid increase in import volumes apparent in Figure 3. Other advantages are that the terms of trade enter into the calculation in a simple way and the formula is easy to intuit.

In subsequent empirical analysis, we choose the import price deflator as  $P^*$  primarily because this is the deflator which underlies the official RGDI series published by the ABS. Also, over the period of interest, the estimated Australian trading gains do not differ significantly when calculated with either of the two main deflators.

The adoption of the import price deflator enables equation (2) to be written as

$$RGDI = RGDP + x\left[\frac{P_x}{P_m} - 1\right] \quad (5)$$

where RGDI is the sum of two terms RGDP and the trading gain.

Since RGDI and the trading gain concepts are not that well known, it is worth spending a little time exploring these concepts when  $P_m$  is chosen as the deflator (see also Coleman (2008)).

---

<sup>10</sup> If the terms of trade do not change there may still be living standard changes if  $P^*$  changes at a different rate than export and import prices. This price change is labeled a real exchange rate change – a gain from a change in the price of traded to non-traded goods. This concept is central to the fixed terms of trade models of Swan (1960), Salter (1959) and Gregory (1976).

<sup>11</sup> The UK, US, Canada and Australia adopt the import price deflator when calculating RGDI.

First, RGDI consists of two parts; a volume measure, RGDP, and a price measure, the trading gain. A terms of trade improvement *must* produce a trading gain for the nation (the direct price effect). There may or may not be a volume effect depending on how RGDP responds to the terms of trade changes (the indirect volume effect). A large export price increase will normally produce a direct price and an indirect volume effect both of which will normally be positive.

Second, no matter how RGDP responds (the indirect volume effect), it cannot change the trading gain (the direct price effect) as long as the price of exports and imports are exogenously determined on world markets. The Australian response to a terms of trade change is very unlikely to affect the world price of imports (Australia is a small country) but for exports this assumption may not be strictly correct because for many key commodity exports, Australia is a relatively large supplier. For this paper, however, we assume no feedback between Australian RGDP responses and the terms of trade.<sup>12</sup>

Third, the direct trading gain effect can be thought of as a free gift in that it requires no additional resources to produce this increase in income and the free gift cannot be eroded by Australian RGDP changes unless they affect world prices.

Fourth, a change in import prices will affect the measure of the trading gain but a change in import volumes will not. The pattern or volume of imports does not enter the trading gain formula when  $P_m$  is chosen as the deflator. There is also no account of whether there is a domestic industry producing close substitutes for imports or whether the value of imports is greater or smaller than the value of exports.<sup>13</sup> Hence, there is no direct mapping from trading gains to structural changes or resource re-allocation across domestic sectors of production. Any volume effects or resource reallocation costs must work through the RGDP component of RGDI.

---

<sup>12</sup> The RGDP response may affect the trading gain if RGDP changes affect world prices. The nature of this link is complex and will vary with the time horizon. An RGDP change may also increase the export volume weight attached to the trading gain and affect the trading gain via this route. In the short run, both these effects can be safely put aside since they will be small.

<sup>13</sup> The United Nations has suggested that when the value of imports exceeds exports the price deflator chosen could be the export price deflator. Under these circumstances, when the terms of trade change, the import volume will affect the trading gain and export volumes will not.

Fifth, an import price fall or an export price rise has the same effect on trading gains. But it does not follow, in the short run, that the effect on RGDP is the same irrespective of the source of the terms of trade change. In the short run, RGDP effects will depend, in part, on different factor intensities of industries.

Sixth, export and import prices may not change relative to each other - the terms of trade may not change - but if import and export prices change relative to domestic prices there may still be significant impacts on resource flows within the economy which will impact on RGDP (Macdonald 2010).

Seventh, the trading gain formula takes no account of foreign capital ownership. Export price increases which accrue to foreign capital – the three largest export mining companies in Australia are foreign owned – will have a different impact on Australian living standards than if the price increases accrue to Australian capital. In principle, RGDI can be adjusted to account for foreign ownership but this issue is complex and is put aside until Part *III*.<sup>14</sup> Also, the extent to which foreigners capture trading gains will depend on the tax regime and given the high level of uncertainty and complexity associated with mining taxes at the moment this is not discussed in this paper.

Eighth, a terms of trade change will affect the Australian nominal exchange rate, and has done so in this and the previous mining boom. A change in the nominal Australian exchange rate, however, should not normally affect the terms of trade and therefore should not affect the size of the trading gain.<sup>15</sup> However, an exchange rate change will affect the trading gain allocation. An appreciation will move some trading gain income from the exporter – export prices fall in domestic currency – to the consumer of imports –import prices fall in domestic currency. An exchange rate change, through its effect of relative prices within Australia will probably also affect RGDP.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Real gross national disposable income (RGNDI) goes beyond RGDI and takes account of dividends and interest payments to and from the rest of the world. This adjustment is not straightforward and is discussed later.

<sup>15</sup> We have, by and large, put aside a discussion of exchange rate changes but the association between Australian mining booms and the exchange rate is very strong (Blundell-Wignall and Gregory (1990)). Between Sep 2001 and June 2011 the Australian exchange rate appreciated 218 per cent against the US dollar, 176 per cent against SDR's and 165 per cent against a trade weighted index.

<sup>16</sup> For exchange rate changes to affect the terms of trade measured in domestic currency requires different exchange rate pass through relationships among exports and imports or a different pattern of currency

## ***Terms of Trade and Australian Income Growth Per Capita***

How much has Australian income increased in response to the exceptional lift in the terms of trade? There are two important short run gains that lift RGDI.

First, there is direct trading gain income effect which is measured by the income gap between RGDP and RGDI.

Second, there is an indirect trading gain income effect that will increase RGDP. Increased optimism about future mineral prices will usually generate an investment boom and increased output. Of course, this indirect effect is only one contributor to RGDP and consequently there is unlikely to be universal agreement as to its relative impact.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, it seems clear that this indirect effect has been very important in Australia. In response to the Global Financial crisis almost all developed economies are experiencing depressed RGDP growth rates and record high unemployment. Australia, in contrast, has avoided any significant falls in RGDP and is experiencing falling unemployment rates that are currently around 5.0 per cent and are considerably lower than the average of the last forty years.

An empirical estimate of the indirect effect involves a comparison between actual RGDP and a counterfactual, an estimate of what RGDP would have been without the trading gain. To estimate a counterfactual is a large and complex task which we do not attempt at this point. Instead, we adopt a descriptive and judgmental approach and turn to accounting identities to describe different sources of income growth and to provide an indication of how large the direct and indirect trading gain income effects might be.

Since we are interested in living standards of all Australians, RGDI will be expressed in per capita terms and related to direct trading and indirect RGDP effects by the following identity,

---

sourcing of exports and imports across countries so that country specific exchange rates may affect the terms of trade through composition effects. It is unlikely that either of these preconditions matter sufficiently for exchange rates to significantly affect the domestic price ratio of exports and imports (see ABS 2004).

<sup>17</sup> There is incomplete agreement as to the relative contribution of the stimulus package, the mining boom and general stability of the banking system to the stronger performance of the Australian economy since 2008. Treasury publications focused on the period around the Global Financial Crisis tend to downplay the contribution of the mining boom and emphasize the policy response and the good economic environment created by earlier policy decisions (see McDonald and Morling (2011), Morling and McDonald (2011)). At mid 2011 there is concern that the exchange rate effect of the mining boom, along with high interest rates, have begun to depress RGDP growth.

$$\frac{RGDI}{Pop} = \frac{RGDP}{Pop} \times \frac{RGDI}{RGDP} \quad (6)$$

The first term on the right hand side of (6) is *RGDP* divided by the population. This measures living standards without adjustment for direct trading gain effects. The application of the second term, *RGDI/RGDP*, adjusts for the direct income effect of the trading gain. Figure 4 plots the time paths of *RGDI* and *RGDP* per capita over the last fifty years (ABS 2011). The gap between the two series in Figure 4 is the contribution of trading gains, *RGDI/RGDP*.

We can learn a little more about changing living standards by using an identity to decompose *RGDP/Pop* into two terms,

$$\frac{RGDP}{Pop} = \frac{RGDP}{Emp} * \frac{Emp}{Pop} \quad (7)$$

the product of labour productivity, *RGDP/Emp*, and the proportion of the population employed, *Emp/Pop*. When *RGDP/Emp* is added to Figure 4 the gap between *RGDP/Pop* and *RGDP/Emp* measures the contribution of changes in the *Emp/Pop* ratio.

Changes in RGDI per capita can now be divided into the three elements; changes in trading gain income, the proportion of the population employed and labour productivity. Each of series included in Figure 4 is presented as an index number based at one hundred in Sept 1959. We divide the discussion of Figure 4 into two periods, the long period 1959 to 2003 and the recent period beginning 2003.

Over the long period, 1959-2003, living standards increased steadily although there are noticeable downturns during the recessions of the early 1980s and 1990s. Living standards increased almost three fold over forty years. The path of each series – *RGDI/Pop*, *RGDP/Pop* and *RGDP/Emp* – is similar and the gaps between them are narrow, although widening towards the end. Narrow gaps indicate that the driving force for living standard increases were overwhelmingly productivity gains rather than increasing employment-population ratios and direct trading gains.

Over the short period, since 2003, living standards have continued to increase and the growth rate has perhaps accelerated slightly. The recent period, however, is different in three important ways.

First, the gap between  $RGDI/Pop$  and  $RGDP/Pop$  - the direct income effect from trading gains - has become large and persistent. RGDI has moved to be 13 percent above RGDP. This is an exceptionally large increase in income over eight years, accounting for 55 per cent of the per capita income growth. This substantial amount is equivalent to about \$8000 per person per year (2011 prices).

Second, the gap between  $RGDP/Pop$  and  $RGDP/Emp$  has also widened significantly indicating that the contribution of increasing  $Emp/Pop$  has become an important contributor to living standard increases.

Third, the growth rate of  $RGDP/Emp$  has slowed and is no longer the driving force for income increases.

Since 2003, the increase in living standards has been 24 per cent, an exceptionally high growth; fifty-five per cent is the result of direct trading gains, thirty per cent the result of increased employment among the population and only fifteen per cent the result of labour productivity growth. Of course, equation (6) and equation (7) are accounting identities, but they make clear that over the mining boom period it is towards increasing employment-population ratios and the trading gains that we must turn to understand the positive factors contributing to living standard increases rather than towards labor productivity increases.

Finally, much of the commentary on Australian macro economic performance over the last decade has been directed towards the *slowdown* in labour productivity growth. Given the size of this productivity slowdown, and its recent trivial contribution to living standard growth, the commentary seems appropriate but, at the same time, commentary has not focused sufficiently on the large positive contribution from trading gains and increased employment and, in that sense, much of the commentary has missed the main game.

## ***Australia US Living Standard Comparisons***

Since Australia has gained twice from the terms of trade increase - experienced a substantial increase in trading gains and avoided the economic downturn in RGDP – the question is naturally raised as to how much has Australian income per capita caught up, or pulled ahead, of other nations? Recent experience of countries that have not been advantaged by terms of trade gains, and whose living standards changed over the last forty years, in much the same way as Australia, might serve as a counterfactual to estimate the path of Australian incomes in the absence of the trading gains.

In this respect, the US might be a good choice as per capita income usually grows at similar rates to Australia and the US has not been subject to noticeable terms of trade changes (Reinsdorf, 2010). The US has another advantage in that it is often used to provide estimates of the RGDP per capita that might be possible if the Australian economy were more efficient.<sup>18</sup> The evolution of Australian-US living standards can be described by identities (6) and (7), defining each element as Australian outcomes relative to those of the US.

The Australian-US comparisons are quite revealing.<sup>19</sup> Consider RGDP per capita (Figure 5). Until 2003, there has been remarkable stability in this relativity. Australian

---

<sup>18</sup> This comparison was motivated by the following considerations; (i) Australia has gained from a terms of trade improvement and the US has not (ii) the US has experienced the full force of the global financial crisis and Australia has not (iii) assessments of Australian economic growth performance usually focus on GDP levels and growth rates and often use US outcomes as the counterfactual “efficient” production frontier (Gregory (1993), Quiggin and Dowrick (1997), Rahman (2005), Davis and Rahman (2006) and Battersby (2006)).

<sup>19</sup> The series used for the comparison are from The Conference Board which has put together macro data from the World Bank, IMF, OECD, Eurostat and national statistical agencies. The series are real GDP per person in current US EKS dollars. The Conference Board takes the Purchasing Power Parity benchmarks between the US and Australia in 2005 and adjusts this index through time by the GDP deflators in each country. This produces a PPP for each year which can be applied to nominal GDP data for each country. The use of GDP deflators means that real GDP measures do not include any terms of trade effects. Notice that the exchange rate plays no direct role in these calculations.

There are two PPP adjusted GDP data series available “Geary-Khamis” (1990 US dollars) and the “EKS” (2005 US dollars). There is a different level effect between the series but no differences in trends or cycles. Before the large Australian terms of trade change the average “GK” Australian GDP per capita is about 77 per cent of that of the US. The “EKS” average ratio is near 88 per cent. We adopt the OECD

RGDP per capita hovered between 86 and 93 per cent of US levels for forty years. Despite different economic policies in each country, different immigration experiences, different labour force participation patterns and the 1970s Australian mineral boom there was little variation in relative RGDP per capita until 2003.

Since 2003, however, Australia has been catching up and RGDP per capita, PPP adjusted, is now about 97 per cent of US levels. Something has changed over the last eight years, something which has not been achieved in the previous forty years. The association of the current mining boom with the sudden lift in RGDP per capita in Australia, relative to the US, suggests that trading gain impacts on RGDP may be large.

What is the source of this sudden catch-up in RGDP? Does it arise from increased Australian efficiency of resource use, which we measure as relative RGDP per employed person, or does it arise from a higher employment utilization of the population, *Emp/Pop*? We can begin to answer these questions by using identity (7) to decompose RGDP per capita of each country into these two elements. Their contribution is most easily seen if each is expressed as an index number with the 1959 base set at unity (Figure 6).

The decomposition reveals a changing pattern over time which is quite different during the two mining booms (Figure 6). Over the 1960s, the US exhibited higher labour productivity and slightly lower employment-population ratios and their interaction produced a higher US-RGDP per capita. In this period, labour productivity and employment-population ratios grew at similar rates in both countries and relative RGDP per capita did not change significantly.

These relationships were substantially disturbed by the macro experiences and mining boom of the early to mid 1970s.<sup>20</sup> Australian labour productivity increased substantially, relative to the US, and remained at these new relative levels for the next two decades. At the same time, the employment-population ratio across the two countries

---

preferred “EKS” series which is based on later data. For a full data description see Chen, Gupta, Therrien, Lervanon and Bart van Ark (2010).

<sup>20</sup> In Australia, the 1970s mineral boom was associated with high inflation, substantial real wage increases and expansion of new welfare programs (Gruen, (2006), Gregory and Frijters (2006) and Gregory (1993)). The US also experienced substantial changes; high inflation and the emergence of skill biased technical change. Both countries experienced very large increases in unemployment to record post World War 2 levels.



followed a path which was the mirror image of the relative labour productivity ratio, increasing substantially in the US but remaining constant in Australia as an increasing proportion of the Australian labour force entered the expanded welfare programs. The mirror image reflections of labour productivity and employment-population changes meant that relative RGDP per capita continued to be largely unchanged.

From the middle to late 1990s there is another shift in outcomes as labour productivity and employment-population ratios begin to revert back to their cross country relativities of two decades earlier. In relative terms, labour productivity begins to fall in Australia and the employment-population ratio begins to rise. Again, each series is largely a mirror image of the other, so the RGDP per capita ratio remains largely unchanged.

Finally, beginning 2003, when significant trading gains begin to occur in Australia, the growth patterns continue but the Australian relative employment-population ratio increases begin to dominate the Australian relative labour productivity declines and Australian RGDP per capita begins to catch-up with the US. This history suggests two important points which are not widely known.

First, RGDP per capita has not been closely related to the changing relative efficiency of labour utilization across the two economies. For most of the period, a strong mirror image effect has operated; any increase in relative labour productivity was offset by a decrease in the relative employment-population ratio. Long run stability of the Australian/US RGDP per capita ratio, until recently, is an important fact to be explained. Why has Australia, until recently failed to catch-up to the US?

Second, the decomposition makes clear a major difference between the two mining boom periods – the first boom is associated with large relative employment-population loss in Australia and the second with a substantial gain. Over the last decade, the Australian employment-population ratio has increased 8 percent and that of the US has fallen 6 percent to produce an Australian employment-population ratio that is now 12 per cent above the US (Figure 7). The Australian employment-population ratio has risen

to its highest level ever. That of the US has fallen to the level prevailing twenty-five years ago.<sup>21</sup>

RGDP comparisons and decompositions, take no account of trading gains.<sup>22</sup> When this is done the changes in the cross-country living standard comparisons are spectacular (Figure 5). Direct trading gain income effects add a further twelve percentage points to Australian living standards. Together, direct and indirect trading gain income effects have lifted Australian living standards, relative to the US, from a long run average of around 92 per cent, over the 1959-2003 period, to a current level of 115 per cent. In just eight years, Australian living standards have increased an amazing 25 per cent, relative to the US; an extra-ordinary change – about one third attributable to increased production of goods and services per capita and two thirds attributable to direct income effects from trading gains. The fifty year history of relative income stability across the two countries, before the terms of trade change, would have suggested that a move of Australian living standards to be above US levels was simply just not possible.<sup>23</sup>

Indeed, I doubt whether a change in relative living standards, of this magnitude and over such a short period, between Australia and other large developed economies has ever occurred before, outside of war periods and their aftermath, and certainly not since the mining boom of the nineteenth century. The special feature which makes this change in living standards so substantial is the positive interaction of two forces favourable to Australia, the trading gain and relatively higher growth of RGDP capita, brought about primarily by increasing employment levels and avoiding the current world recession. Usually, Australian trading gains are positively associated with strong economic growth in developed economies, including the US, and, in these circumstances, the Australian relative income increase is largely confined to the direct effect of the trading gain since

---

<sup>21</sup> There has been a small change in relative hours worked per person across the two countries which do not significantly change the conclusions based on employed persons.

<sup>22</sup> The relative unimportance of US trading gains can be seen by comparing the US Department of Commerce Command GDP series 1959-2009 with the unadjusted GDP series.

<sup>23</sup> There is inevitably uncertainty about relative income levels across countries and from this perspective PPP calculations require more attention and need to be updated. However, as noted earlier, the choice of PPP index from the Conference Board has virtually no effect on changes in income relativities through time because PPP calculations have typically been made for one year and then for all other years the PPP calculation is adjusted by the relative rates of GDP price increases for each country.

all countries share in strong RGDP growth. The dislocation of the close positive relationship between the Australian trading gain and the economic growth cycle of developed countries, is a completely new feature, generated by the decoupling of Asian growth rates - primarily China and India – from the growth rates of the developed economies. Relative to most other developed countries Australia has been twice blessed by the terms of trade increase.

The understandable failure of recent economic research to anticipate the extraordinary and unexpected lift in Australian living standards is worth noting. The most recent studies of Australian living standards, relative to the US, have focused on RGDP per capita, where the dominant fact to be explained, over the fifty years before 2003, is the relative constancy of the Australian-US relativity (Rahman (2005), Battersby (2006), Wilkie and McDonald (2008), OECD (2008)). The focus of these Treasury and OECD studies was primarily to explain why Australian living standards had failed to increase relative to the US for almost half a century and why in the future it might be expected that there would be very little or no catch-up.

These studies estimate that about half of the living standard gap could be explained by the negative contribution of Australia's distance from world markets (an influence unlikely to be offset). Furthermore, OECD (2008) estimated that the relative favorable advantage delivered by the Australian mineral sector offset only about 2.3 percentage points of the living standard gap with the US, a contribution about one fifth as important as the negative contribution of Australia's remoteness.

But, as is demonstrated above, the mining boom, primarily through a trading gain price effect may have increased Australia living standards by as much as 25 percentage points, relative to the US, a much different estimate from the OECD estimated mining volume contribution of 2.7 percentage points to narrow the gap. All these studies focus on RGDP, ignore trading gains and therefore provided an inadequate framework to understand the very large lift in living standards that has suddenly occurred.

### ***III***

## ***Further Reflections on Free Gifts and their Macro Implications***

Trading gains are produced by *price* changes and *not* by *output* changes. Hence, no additional resources are required to realize trading gain income. This special feature raises three sets of interrelated questions.<sup>24</sup>

First, because no additional resources are required, should trading gains be thought of as a free gift? Can the free gift really be so large? Who receives this free gift?<sup>25</sup>

Second, because no additional resources are needed, trading gains can only impact on RGDP through indirect output effects generated by the price changes. What is known about these indirect output effects?

Third, what happens if the free gift is suddenly withdrawn?

### ***Who Receives the Free Gift?***

Currently, the trading gain is adding 12 per cent to Australian income without any direct resource cost. If trading gains lead to faster changes in production patterns this will add to resource reallocation costs which should be set against the free gift, although current unemployment rates suggest that these costs are not substantial to this point (Gruen, 2011).

The size of the free gift is an artificial construct. Its measurement only exists when an attempt is made to estimate income in real terms, which will depend on the deflator choice. But no individual or company only exports and spends the revenue only on imports. Hence, there can be no simple direct mapping from the trading gain to an individual or company. It is not possible, in practice, to be precise as to the magnitude of

---

<sup>24</sup> These questions were not central to the 1976 analysis of resource allocation responses to a volume based mineral boom and among the academic community they have been largely ignored. The Treasury and the Reserve Bank of Australia, however, have begun to focus their attention on these issues, see Henry (2006), Lowe (2009 ) and more recently Stevens (2011), Gruen (2011) and Connelly and Orsmond (2011).

<sup>25</sup> These remarks, of course, refer to a situation where the export price increase was not anticipated and did not lead to investments in earlier periods that are now just receiving their anticipated returns. Most mining investments over the previous two decades before 2003 occurred well before there was an indication of such a substantial increase in the price of mineral exports.

the gift delivered to various groups. Trading gains are quite different from RGDP estimates which, in principle, can be built up from individual or company outputs, income, expenditure and the prices received and paid. Nevertheless, rough calculations can provide some feel for who is receiving trading gain income.

In the first round, a substantial part of trading gains from mineral export price increases flows to resources involved in the mining export industry.

Mining is a small employer of labour. Total compensation of mining employees, as a ratio of all industry employee compensation is very low, around 2 per cent, and this share has not changed significantly in response to the export price increase (Table 1). Labour, therefore, has not and cannot receive a significant share of the free gift through the change in the price of labour in mining relative to other industries.<sup>26</sup>

Mining, however, is very capital intensive and mining shareholders are first round beneficiaries of the free gift. Since the terms of trade improvement mining profits have doubled as a proportion of all industry profits, increasing from 7 to 14 per cent, and now account for one dollar of profits in every seven; a truly exceptional change equivalent to a 4 percentage point increase in the mining profit share of current price national income. This change, however, is significantly less than the earlier free gift estimate of twelve per cent? Who receives the remaining 60 to 70 per cent of the direct trading gain? This share arises from second round effects.

Trading gains usually change the relative price of traded to non-traded goods and consumption and production patterns respond. The fall in the relative price of traded goods, usually effected in the short run by exchange rate appreciations, takes some of the initial trading gain income away from the mining industry – by reducing export prices in domestic currency - and re-allocates the trading gains to those who buy imports or products with a large import component - which are now cheaper in domestic currency than they otherwise would have been. A significant share of trading gains, therefore, are

---

<sup>26</sup> Finally, Table 1 makes clear that mining industry value added in current prices has doubled as a proportion of the value added of all industry, but, in constant prices, mining value added has not changed as a proportion of industry value added. Hence, to this point, the free gift has not led to noticeable changes in real mining output, or a significant increase in utilization of resources in the mining industry. These changes are yet to come. The main direct contribution to RGDP to this point flows from the construction industry building new mining facilities.

likely to be reallocated by an appreciation of the exchange rate which leaves the terms of trade unaffected - and hence the size of the gift - but reduces both export and import prices relative to domestic prices. Since mining employs only 2 per cent of the labour force, labour will primarily receive its trading gain share through greater purchasing power generated by lower import prices.

Since trading gain income is large it is to be expected that induced relative price changes will be large. Figure 8 illustrates this for three important price ratios: the Household Final Consumption deflator divided by the price deflator of GDP, exports and imports.

First, after increasing steadily over the 1979 to 2000 period the path of the final household consumption - export deflator ratio suddenly changes direction in response to the large increase in export prices and falls about 30 per cent, the largest fall over this fifty year period.

Second, there is a noticeable trend change in the household consumption - import price ratio as it begins to increase at a faster pace from the beginning of the last decade as the relative price of imports fall.

Third, there has been a recent 11 per cent fall in the final household consumption deflator relative to the GDP deflator.

These large relative price changes which are producing shifts in real incomes across groups re-emphasize two important points. One point is that the focus on export price increases has tended to overshadow how important falling import prices, relative to domestic prices, have been in redistributing trading gains. Although the terms of trade are independent of exchange rate changes the traded to non-traded relative price is not. Hence, some of the recent import price falls, relative to the household final consumption deflator, are generated by the export price effect on the exchange rate. Indeed, as was noted earlier, to this point it has been the import/GDP volume ratio that has adjusted to the terms of trade increase rather than the export/GDP volume ratio.

Another point is that since the household final consumption- import price deflator has increased by 10 per cent relative to past trends it may be that more than half of the terms of trade gains have been captured by those who consume imports.

Understanding the changing relative price impact on the distribution of trading gain income is a complex and neglected task and a vigorous research agenda needs to be developed. Establishing a counterfactual path for relative prices, in the absence of trading gains, is an essential input to measuring who is receiving the free gift (Feenstra, Mandel, Reinsdorf and Slaughter (2009)).

### ***The Importance of Foreign Ownership***

Almost all first round trading gain income flows to mining profits. Who owns these mining profits? Could it be that most of the first round allocation of the trading gain accrues to foreign shareholders and not to Australians?

Suppose, for example, the mining sector was completely foreign owned and export prices increased but output and all other prices and costs are unchanged. Then, *all* the export price component of trading gain income would go to foreigners in the first instance, except for Australian tax receipts. Suppose further, that the trading gain profits are instantly repatriated. Under these circumstances, and putting tax receipts aside, there would be no exchange rate appreciations in response to the terms of trade increase – increased export receipts would be matched by increased overseas remittances. The mining industry would operate as a foreign enclave with no trading gains flowing to Australian residents.<sup>27</sup> In these circumstances, we might think of the Australian mining industry in much the same way as we think of the mining industry in some African states; an economic enclave that delivers no trading gains to domestic residents. Any income effects from export price increases will be effective not through trading gains but through indirect effects on RGDP if mining investment and output responds positively to the export price increase.

Of course, the Australian mining industry is not completely foreign owned but foreign ownership is high.<sup>28</sup> The two largest mining companies, BHP Billiton and Rio Tinto, seem to be about 85 per cent foreign owned and Xstrata, the third largest, is 100

---

<sup>27</sup> This would occur to some degree even if there was a mining investment boom. The enclave aspect would be delayed until after the post construction period when the extra exports would make few demands on Australian resources and a large share of the export receipts could be repatriated.

<sup>28</sup> There was a large shift in ownership between 2000 and 2005. Of the top 20 mining companies on the Australian Securities Exchange in 2000 only 7 of these were still listed in Australia at the end of 2005 (Connelly and Orsmond, 2011).

per cent foreign owned. For the industry as a whole foreign ownership might be 80 per cent (Edwards 2011). It is surprising, therefore, that the trading gain - foreign ownership relationship has not received more analytical attention.<sup>29</sup>

One way to explore the empirics of foreign ownership relationships is to turn to ABS statistics. Surprisingly, however, the ABS does not publish current foreign ownership data. Furthermore, some data, which at first glance might be thought to be useful as a measure of the changing importance of foreign profits in mining, is not particularly helpful.

To adjust for foreign ownership, and measure the change in Australian consumption possibilities in response to trading gains, the ABS calculates real gross national income, RGNI, by subtracting from RGDI “real incomes payable to and receivable from the rest of the world.” This subtraction includes dividends and reinvested earnings. If all trading gains were flowing into profits of foreign owned companies and repatriated as dividends, the gap between RGDI and RGNI would widen significantly to encompass trading gain effects as measured by increased foreign dividends.

The RGDI-RGNI gap, before the terms of trade increase, was 2.5 per cent of RGDI. Today the gap is 3.7 per cent, an increase of only 1.2 percentage points, or about one tenth of our earlier trading gain estimate and one third of the mining industry profit increase. Why is the change in the RGDI-RGNI gap so small when the foreign ownership in mining is so high? The answer lies, in part, in national accounting conventions.

When companies distribute profits as dividends the ABS appropriately subtracts foreign dividends from RGDI. The foreign dividend share is calculated in proportion to the foreign share of company ownership. But currently mining industry dividends are relatively unimportant. Profits are being kept within foreign companies as retained

---

<sup>29</sup> One obvious implication of a high degree of foreign ownership is that the mining tax incidence will fall overwhelmingly on foreigners and not Australians. Looking back over the Australian mining tax debate it does seem strange that so much of the debate was focused on the differential treatment of large and small mining firms rather than tax incidence between foreigners and domestic residents. It also seems incongruous that the foreign owned companies that financed the advertising campaign against the mining tax, which in part led to replacement of an Australian prime minister, stressed that Australian citizens would lose most from the mining tax rather than their foreign share holders who are overwhelmingly in the majority.



earnings to finance much of the new mining investment. A large proportion of trading gain foreign profits therefore is not immediately flowing out of Australia as dividends.<sup>30</sup>

Foreign retained profits, however, are treated quite differently from foreign dividends and are **not** allocated according to the foreign proportion of share ownership. The ABS, following international standards, allocates retained earnings according to a foreign control concept (OECD, 2008). For this purpose a company as “foreign” owned if one foreign identity owns 10 per cent or more of the shares. Otherwise, the company is classified as domestic. If the company is foreign, all retained earnings are treated as foreign remittances. If the company is domestic, all retained earnings are treated as belonging to Australians. Thus, BHP Billiton and Rio Tinto, for example, are probably classified as domestic as no one foreign entity holds more than ten per cent of shares. Xstrata would be classified as foreign owned – one foreign entity owns more than 10 per cent of shares. Hence, none of the retained earnings by BHP Billiton and Rio Tinto will be identified as foreign remittances that are reinvested in the company. All retained earnings of Xstrata, on the other hand, will be measured as foreign remittances. The adjustment of RGDI to calculate RGNI will subtract retained earnings from Xstrata but make no adjustment for retained earnings of BHP Billiton and Rio Tinto. This differential accounting treatment of the same economic phenomenon has all sorts of important implications. Thus, during the current foreign company mining investment phase, financed largely by retained earnings, there may be little indication in the changing RGDI – RGNI gap that there is a large increase in foreign profits from trading gains.

It seems clear that Australian data collection and accounting practices, as they relate to foreign ownership of the mining industry, are not as good as they should be. International national accounting conventions are not serving Australia well in this instance.<sup>31</sup>

To sum up, a proportion of the trading gain will accrue to foreigners and the estimated lift in Australian living standards as measured in Figure 4 will need to be

---

<sup>30</sup> World wide, Rio Tinto reinvested earnings are nine times larger than their distributed profits.

<sup>31</sup> Trading gain-foreign ownership relationships become more complex when we move to the general equilibrium effects in response to any exchange rate adjustment that reallocates some of the trading gains from exporters to those who buy imports. At this point, the relative degree of foreign ownership across different sectors of the economy becomes relevant. For example, if a large proportion of the additional and cheaper imports flow to parts of the economy with a high degree of foreign ownership, or to the mining industry as investment goods, the trading gain impact on domestic residents will be less.

adjusted downwards. The extent of the adjustment will vary through time. In the short run, my guess is that currently the foreign share of the trading gains, depending in part of the impact of the new mining tax regime, will be about one fifth of the 12 per cent increase in “living standards.” Currently, because of the exchange rate appreciations, most of the gains have gone to those who are consuming cheaper imports. In the long run, when the investment phase is finished, export volumes have increased and more profits are repatriated it should be expected that the exchange rate will depreciate and the trading gains reallocated back to the mining industry. Then, perhaps the foreign share might be about half of the trading gain, depending on the tax regime.

### ***What if the free gift is taken away?***

In the past, large Australian trading gains have tended to be short lived. Are circumstances different now? Will there the lift in Australia’s living standards be permanent?

It is not possible to confidently predict the future terms of trade path as is evident from the surprising fact that industry and policy experts did not foresee the large, rapid and sustained export price increase that began around 2003 (Treasury, 2002-2003)<sup>32</sup>. The current consensus, however, is that the terms of trade will not fall back to previous levels, although in the past they have always done so and fallen beyond the previous low point.<sup>33</sup> But what if the terms of trade did fall? How far could Australian living standards decline? What adjustments would occur?

---

<sup>32</sup> In the year that the terms of trade began to increase to their highest level ever in the post war period, generated by mineral price increases, the Treasury commented in Statement Number 4 of the Budget Papers that,

*“The terms of trade is likely to be more stable in the future because of the diversification of Australia’s trade baskets (across products and destinations), the improved insulation of the Australian economy from foreign economic events, and the generally more stable global economy. The increasing importance of ICT and other related products in Australia’s imports basket is likely to provide continued strength to the level of Australia’s terms of trade.”* Treasury (2002-03), (My italics).

Treasury, along with many others were focusing on import price changes and increased export diversification and completely missed the coming export mineral price boom.

<sup>33</sup> The Treasury in the 2010 Intergenerational Report assumes that the terms of trade will remain above the previous 1974-75 peak for the next twenty years but will steadily decline to be about thirty per cent above the 1980-2000 average. These projections therefore assume that Australian living standards are likely to remain above those of the US for some time unless US RGDP per capita begins to reverse its recent deterioration relative to Australia.

The direct living standard fall, measured by a trading gain loss, is a straightforward calculation. If the terms of trade moved back to their 2003 ratio, RGDI, without any indirect RGDP response, would fall 12 per cent. This would be the largest negative macro shock to Australian living standards since the 1930s depression (Gregory, 1988).<sup>34</sup>

During recent recessions, 1981-84 and 1990-1993, RGDI falls were temporary and much smaller than 12 per cent and yet they produced considerable and long lasting increases in unemployment. In the early 1980s recession RGDI fell 7 per cent between June 1982 and March 1983 and then increased rapidly to reach a new peak within five quarters. Unemployment, however, increased from 6.8 to 10.3 per cent over a similar period and remained high for many years. In the early 1990s recession, RGDI fell 3 per cent between June 1990 and Dec 1991 and then increased quickly to reach a new peak in four quarters. Once again unemployment increased to around 10 per cent and was slow to fall.

Since the trading gain loss would be two to four times the RGDI declines during the 1982 and 1991 recessions, and would be longer lasting, could unemployment increase two to four times that of previous recessions?

Furthermore, if RGDP responds to the fall in RGDI, as might be expected, the decline in living standards will be even greater. For example, if the RGDP - RGDI elasticity were unity - a twelve per cent drop in living standards, generated by a trading gain income loss, produces a twelve per cent fall in production of domestic goods and services - then Australia would be subject to a twenty-four per cent reduction of living standards, a decline that is three to eight times greater than the fall in the 1981 and 1990s recessions. Would a 24 percent decline in living standards produce a seven to eight fold increase in unemployment to levels in excess of 30 per cent?

These calculations might seem to be alarmist, and I think they are, but they illustrate a number of interesting and important points.

One point is that a real income loss from removal of a twelve per cent trading gain, and assuming a RGDP-RGDI elasticity of unity, produces a living standard loss that is

---

<sup>34</sup> Of course, if the terms of trade were to fall to the level predicted on the basis of long run trends, the fall would be even greater.

very similar to the last decade loss in US living standards relative to Australia. So the mechanical calculation of changing living standards if the free gift is taken away seems about right. So why do I not believe that a 24 per cent reduction in living standards would increase Australian unemployment to three to eight times that of the 1981 and 1991 recessions? Is it because a living standard loss of one dollar of trading gains is quite different from a living standards loss of one dollar of RGDP? It must be related to this, in part, because relative unemployment between Australia and the US only changed by about five to six percentage points and not 24 percentage points.

There are many slippages between living standard changes and labour market outcomes as measured by employment and unemployment. These slippage can be summarized by key parameters that need to be better understood.

First, employment responds to RGDP and not to direct trading gains. So the first parameter of interest is how RGDP responds to trading gain losses. If RGDP is unaffected by the trading gain removal then presumably nothing happens to employment even though living standards are significantly reduced. All the trading gain income loss falls on imports. But this seems an extremely unlikely event except in the long run. In the short run, RGDP should fall, reduce employment and contribute further to the reduction of living standards. The RGDP – RGDI elasticity should not be zero.

So what might be a reasonable guess as to the RGDP elasticity to a trading gain loss? How might this elasticity change over time? There have been very few attempts to answer these important questions, partly because Australia has not found itself in this situation since the Korean War. But there are some indirect estimates that can be found.

First, in an appendix to an OECD paper, Turner (2006) uses 2006 simulations of the Treasury TRYM model to measure the effect of a terms of trade increase.<sup>35</sup> These simulations suggest, in the first year, that RGDP falls in response to the living standard increase, the fall being generated by resource reallocation across industry in response to the exchange rate appreciation. From the second year RGDP begins to increase, the elasticity is about 0.15 per cent, and from the third year forward the elasticity remains at

---

<sup>35</sup> Although the model had been fitted to data before the recent large terms of trade changes the output simulations can be used to provide some idea of the relevant elasticity. The simulations are for a 7 per cent increase in the terms of trade from an increase in export prices. This is equivalent to a 1.4 per cent trading gain. We assume symmetry and linearity of the response.

about 0.4 per cent. An elasticity of 0.4 per cent suggests that a trading gain loss of 12 per cent would produce a RGDP loss of about five percentage points, this would produce a marginally greater RGDP loss than that of the recessions of the early eighties and nineties although, in this instance, it would be a permanent rather than a cyclical loss.<sup>36</sup> The permanent loss must have very adverse effects on unemployment as in the previous recessions the loss of living standards only lasted four or five quarters.

Is 0.4 per cent a reasonable estimate for this elasticity? I don't know. It depends, in part, on the time period. Living standard changes generated by trading gain changes are made effective through import variations. So, in the long run, the trading gain RGDP elasticity could be very low as imports rise or fall to deliver the changing trading gain contributions to changing living standards. In this short run, however, the RGDI-RGDP elasticity might be higher because of the investment response.

Second, there may be a link between changes in trading gains and changes in labour productivity although the nature of this link is not clear. The sketchy empirical evidence seems to suggest, somewhat surprisingly, that trading gain income may reduce productivity both in the mining industry and at the macro economy level (Macdonald, 2010).<sup>37</sup> This association is already evident in the Australian data.

Third, depressed labour demand leads to withdrawal from the labour force which acts to mute the unemployment increase when trading gains are withdrawn. Since, 2003 relative employment between the US and Australia has fallen 12 per cent but sixty per cent of this fall has been reflected in relative labour force participation rate withdrawal rather than relative unemployment increases.

To conclude, very little is known about the interrelationships between variations in living standards, RGDI, RGDP, employment and unemployment. Given our extensive ignorance the simple empirical exercise of adopting a US counterfactual is probably the

---

<sup>37</sup> At the macro level, Macdonald (2010) remarks that the four countries with the largest increase in trading gains have all experienced relative productivity declines but offers no explanation as to whether this association is causal. At the micro level, the ABS (2010) and Topp, Soames, Parham and Bloch (2008) have recently provided productivity estimates that show, between 1974-75 and 2007-08, that multi-factor productivity has fallen in mining by 25 per cent and, over this thirty year period, mining has been the only industry that has reduced Australian living standards by productivity falls.

best that can be done at this point. But the need for more research, probably with an econometric economy-wide model framework, is essential.

## *IV*

### *Concluding Remarks*

I have welcomed the opportunity to provide these reflections and have been surprised at the wide range of emotional responses and intellectual challenges I have experienced.

I have been excited by the process of documenting the extra-ordinary changes that are occurring in the Australian economy. In peace time, and over such a sustained period, Australia has never experienced such a large increase in income relative to so many other advanced economies. It now appears, following current national accounting practices, that Australian per capita income levels have increased about 25 per cent relative to the US and now exceed US levels.

It has been difficult to tie together in a coherent and simple way the large changes that have been occurring. It is frustrating not to understand better the wide range of theoretical and empirical links between trading gains, foreign ownership, RGDP, productivity and labour force changes. There is considerable theorizing, model building and data collection yet to be done.

One area in which I have felt least comfortable is the analysis of future possible time paths of the mineral boom. A significant fraction of RGDP, and the employment growth being generated today, is not from an export volume boom but from a construction boom as new mines are built. This has two interesting features. One feature is that the mining boom is primarily foreign financed, largely from retained earnings and this foreign investment “inflow” may be accounting for a significant proportion of the exchange rate appreciation that is allocating a significant proportion of the trading gain to wage and salary earners. The other feature is that construction is a labour intensive activity which is generating substantial employment and RGDP increases. When construction stops, these two features of the mining boom will disappear. Additional mining exports will add to RGDP but employ very little labour. Export profits will be increasingly repatriated and offset potential exchange rate appreciations induced by the

extra exports. The exchange rate should depreciate. Does this scenario imply a substantial resource reallocation back to the industries that they previously left? Can this return be as easy as the reallocation that is occurring in response to the investment boom or will there be a long drawn out period of insufficient employment? Furthermore, productivity will increase as exports increase but the productivity gains will largely accrue to foreigners.

Another worrying issue is that a substantial proportion of the RGDI gain in living standards is being delivered to wage earners by real wage increases generated by lower import prices in response to the exchange rate appreciations. These price changes have significantly lowered inflation in Australia. If the exchange rate begins to depreciate it will reallocate trading gain income back to mining industry profits through higher export prices in domestic currency and away from labour. The real income falls for labour will make it difficult to manage the transition phase from construction to export growth.

To conclude, I have been surprised that the simple question – what difference does it make whether the mining boom is generated by a price or volume increase – has led to reflections that are so wide-ranging and untidy, perhaps an inevitable outcome of the rapid changes that are occurring. We are certainly living in extremely interesting times, but hopefully not in the “Chinese” sense of the phrase, although China is largely at the centre of these amazing changes.

## *References*

- United Nations (1968), “A System of National Accounts”, in *Studies in Methods*, Ser. F, No. 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> Revn. New York; United Nations
- United Nations (2008), *System of National Accounts 2008*, New York
- OECD (2008), *Benchmark Definition of Foreign Direct Investment*, Fourth Edition, 2008
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001), “Real net national disposable income - a new national accounts measure”, *Australian National Accounts: National Income, Expenditure and Product* (Cat. No. 5206.0), December Quarter
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2004), “The Terms of Trade and the National Accounts”, in *Australian National Accounts: National Income, Expenditure and Product, September Quarter 2004*, Cat. No. 5206.0, ABS, Canberra
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2010), “Experimental Estimates of Industry Multifactor Productivity, Australia: Detailed Productivity Estimates”, Cat. No. 5206.0.55.002, ABS, Canberra
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2011), “Australian National Accounts; National income, Expenditure and Product”, Cat. No. 5206.0, ABS, Canberra, March
- Australian Treasury (2002-03), Statement 4, “Australian Terms of Trade, Stronger and less Volatile”, Budget Paper No. 1, Budget Strategy and Outlook, 2002-03, Canberra
- Reserve Bank of Australia (2005), “Commodity Prices and the Terms of Trade”, *Reserve Bank of Australia Bulletin*, April
- Battersby, B. (2006), "Does Distance Matter? The Effect of Geographic Isolation on Productivity Levels", *OECD Economic Studies*, No 42
- Blundell-Wignall, A. and R. G. Gregory (1990), “Exchange Rate Policy in Advanced Commodity – Exporting Countries. The Case of Australia and NZ”, *OECD Economic Development, Working Paper 83*, OECD Publishing
- Chen V. and A. Gupta, A. D. Therrien, G. Lervanon and Bart van Ark (2010), “Recent Productivity Developments in the World Economy: An Overview from The Conference Board Total Economy Database”, *International Productivity Monitor*, The Conference Board
- Coleman, W. (2008), “Gauging Economic Performance under Changing Terms of Trade Real Gross Domestic Income or Real Gross Domestic Product”, *Economic Papers*, 27 (4) Dec., 1-116



- Corden, W. M. (1960), "Geometric Representation of Policies to Attain Internal and External Balance", *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol 28, 1-22
- Corden, W. M. (1984), "Booming Sector and Dutch Disease Economic Survey and Reconciliation", *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol 33, 59-380
- Corden, W. M. and P. Neary (1982), "Booming Sector and De-Industrialization in a Small Open Economy", *Economic Journal*, 92 (Dec) 825 -45
- Connolly, E, and D. Orsmond (2011), "The Mining Industry: From Bust to Boom, The Australian Economy in the 2000s, Reserve Bank of Australia, 15-16 August
- Davis, G. and J. Rahman (2006), "Perspectives on Australia's Productivity Prospects", Treasury Working Paper, 2006-04, September
- Diewert, W. E. and C. J. Morrison (1986), "Adjusting Output and Productivity indexes for Changes in the Terms of Trade", *The Economic Journal*, Vol 96, No 383 Sept.
- Dorrance, G. S. The Income Terms of Trade, *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol 16. No 1(1948-1949), 50-56
- Edwards, N (2011), "Foreign ownership of Australian mining profits" , Briefing paper prepared for the Australian Greens
- Feenstra, R. C. and A. Heston, M. P. Timmer and H. Deng (2009), "Estimating Real Production and Expenditure Across Nations: A Proposal for Improving the Penn World Tables", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Feb, Vol 91 No.1, 201-212
- Feenstra, R. C. and B. S. Mandel, M. B. Reinsdorf and M. J. Slaughter (2009). "Effects of Terms of Trade Gains and Tariff Changes on the Measurement of US Productivity Growth", NBER Working Paper, 15592, Dec
- Forsyth, P. J. and J. P. Kay (1981), "Oil Revenues and Manufacturing Output", *Fiscal Studies*, July 9-17
- Gregory, R. G. (1976), "Some Implications of the Growth of the Mineral Sector", *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 20 (August), 71-91
- Gregory, R. G. and P. Frijters (2006), " From Golden Age to Golden Age, Australia's Great Leap Forward, *The Economic Record*, Vol 82 (257), 207 -224
- Gregory, R. G. (1988), "An Overview" in R. G. Gregory and N.G. Butlin, (eds) *Recovery from the Depression Australia and the World Economy in the 1930s*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne

- Gregory, R. G. (1993), "Aspects of Australian and the US Living Standards; the Disappointing Decades 1970 -1990", *Economic Record*, Vol 69 (204), March, 61-76
- Gruen, D. (2006), "A tale of two terms of trade booms", *Economic Roundup*, Treasury, Summer, 21-34
- Gruen, D. (2011), "The Macroeconomic and Structural Implications of a Once in a lifetime Boom in the Terms of Trade", Address to the Australian Business Economics Annual Conference, 24 November
- Gruen, F. H. (1975), "The 25% Tariff Cut Was it a Mistake?", *The Australian Quarterly*, Vol 47 No 2, June
- Henry, K. (2007), "Achieving and Maintaining Full Employment", The 2007 Sir Roland Wilson Foundation Lecture, Canberra, August
- Kay, J. and P. J. Forsyth (1980), "The Economic Implication of North Sea Oil Revenues", *Fiscal Studies*, Vol No 3, July
- Kohli, Ulrich R. (2004), "Real GDP, real domestic income and terms-of-trade changes", *Journal of International Economics*, January, 62
- Long, N.V. (1983), "On the Effect of a Booming Export Industry on the Rest of the Economy", *Economic Record*, 59, March, 57-60
- Lowe, P. (2009), "The Growth of Asia and Some Implications for Australia", Reserve Bank of Australia, *Bulletin*, November
- Lowe, P. (2011), "Changing Relative Prices and the Structure of the Australian Economy", Address to the Australian Industry Group, 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Economic Forum, 8 March
- Macdonald, R. (2010), "Real Gross Domestic Income Relative Prices and Economic Performance Across the OECD", *Review of Income and Wealth*, September, Vol 5, Issue 3, 449-650
- McDonald, T and S. Morling (2011) Reasons for Resilience: The Australian Economy and the Global Downturn Part 1, *Economic Roundup, Issue 2*, Commonwealth of Australia
- Maddock, R. and I. McLean (1983), "Supply Side Shocks, The Case of Australian Gold", *The Journal of Economic History*, 44(4), 1047 -1067
- Magud, N. and S. Sosa (2010), "When and Why Worry About Real Exchange Rate Appreciations? The Missing Link between Dutch Diseases and Growth", IMF Working Paper, Dec. WP/10/27

Morling, S. and T. McDonald (2011), "The Australian Economy and the Global Downturn Part 2: The key quarters", *Economic Roundup, Issue 2*, Commonwealth of Australia

Nicholson, J. L. (1960), "The Effect of international trade on the measurement of real national income", *Economic Journal*, 70, 608-612

Rahman, J. (2005), "Comparing Australian and United States productivity", *Economic Roundup*, Autumn, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra

Reinsdorf, M. B. (2010), "Terms of Trade Effects, Theory and Measurement", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 56, Special Issue, June

Salter, W. E. G. (1959), "Internal and External Balance; The Role of Price and Expenditure Effects", *Economic Record*, Vol 35 August, 225-230

Shann, E. W. (1983), "Policy Issues in Mineral Sector Growth, A Keynesian Model", Discussion Paper No. 60, December, *Centre for Economic Policy Research*, Australian National University, Canberra

Silver, M. and K. Mahdavy (1989), "The Measurement of a Nation's Terms of Trade Effect and Real National Disposable Income within a National Accounting Framework", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series A, Vol. 152, No. 1 87-107

Snape, R. (1977), "Effects of Mineral Development and the Economy", *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, December, 147-56

Stevens, G. (2010), "The Challenge of Prosperity", Address to the Committee for the Economic Development of Australia (CEDA), Melbourne, 29 November

Stoeckel, A. (1979), "Some Equilibrium Effects of Mining Growth on the Economy", *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 21 April 1-22

Swan, T. W. (1960), "Economic Control in a Dependent Economy", *The Economic Record*, Vol 36, 57-66

Swan, W., Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Australia (2010), *Australia to 2050: Future Challenges*, Canberra, January

Taussig, F. W. (1927), *International Trade*, The Macmillan Co., New York

Topp, V. L. Soames, D. Parham, and H. Bloch (2008), "Productivity in the Mining Industry; Measurement and Interpretation", Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper, Dec

Turner, D. (2006), "Should Measures of Fiscal Stance be adjusted for Terms of Trade Effects", Economic Department Working Paper, No 519, OECD Paris

Warr, P. (2006), "The Gregory Thesis Visits the Tropics", *The Economic Record*, Vol (82) 257, 177-194

Wilkie and T McDonald (2008), "Economic geography and economic performance in Australia", Economic Round-up Issue No. 3, The Treasury, Australian Government

Wilson, R. (1931), *Capital Imports and the Terms of Trade Examined in the Light of 60 Years of Australian Borrowing*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne

Figure 1 Commodity Prices, Australia  
Index 1982=100, Based on 2008/09 weights




Figure 2 Terms of Trade, Australia  
Index 1959=1.0



Source - RBA, Statistical Table G4.

Years

Figure 3 Volume and Value \$m Ratios (sa), Mar 1959=1.00  
Australia, 1959-2010





Figure 4 Labour Productivity and Living Standard Measures  
Australia, 1959-2010




Source - The Conference Board Total Economy Database, January 2011.  
ABS Cat No 5206, Table 1.

Years



Figure 5 Australia to US Ratio, per capita  
1959-2010



Source - The Conference Board Total Economy Database, January 2011, 2010 EKS\$  
ABS Cat No 5206, Table 1.

Years

Figure 6 Australia to US Ratios, 1959=1.0  
1959-2010





Figure 7 Employment to Population Ratio  
1959-2010



**Table 1 Mining Share of Total: Profit, Compensation of Employees and Value Added**

	<u>Current price share</u>			<u>Constant price share</u>
	Profit	Total Compensation of Employees	Value Added	Value Added
1992	8.3	2.7	5.1	10.7
2002	9.2	2	5.3	10.3
2004	7.3	2.1	4.4	9.3
2006	13.3	2.4	7.4	9.4
2008	14.1	2.7	7.8	9.7
2010	14.9	3	8.6	10.1

Source: 5220.0 Australian National Accounts: State Accounts, Table 4 and Table 10.

Figure 8 Price ratios (sa), Mar 1959=1.0  
1959-2010

