IMPACT PROJECT

A Commonwealth Government inter-agency project in co-operation with the University of Melbourne, to facilitate the analysis of the impact of economic demographic and social changes on the structure of the Australian economy

A SKELETAL VERSION OF ORANI 78 : THEORY, DATA, COMPUTATIONS AND RESULTS

by

Peter B. Dixon, La Trobe University

Preliminary Working Paper No. OP-24 Melbourne June 1979

Reprinted August 1980

IMPACT PROJECT RESEARCH CENTRE 153 Barry Street, Carlton 3053

Postal Address: Impact Centre, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Vic., 3052, Australia

Phones: (03) 345 1844 extensions 7417 & 7418

After hours (03) 341 7417 or 341 7418.

Contents

A SKELETAL VERSION OF ORANI 78 : THEORY, DATA, COMPUTATIONS AND RESULTS

by

Peter B. Dixon*
La Trobe University
June 1979

INTRODUCTION

The ORANI model has been developed as part of the IMPACT Project.[1] The initial version of the model is documented in complete technical detail in the second volume of IMPACT's first progress report.[2] There has been a demand, however, for a less detailed presentation : a presentation which is still aimed at professional economists but which makes the principal ideas more rapidly accessible.

This paper attempts to meet that demand. In addition, it provides an opportunity for introducing features of the second generation ORANI model, ORANI 78. The main advance in ORANI 78 over the model described in DPRS [1977] is the allowance for multiproduct industries. This feature is particularly important for modelling agricultural industries.[3] Technical documentation for ORANI 78 is currently in preparation.

ORANI is a highly disaggregated model of the Australian economy. The numbers of equations and variables are of the order of several millions. The theoretical structure, however, is simple and

---

* The author is indebted to Tony Lawson for a large number of helpful comments on an earlier draft.

1. For a comprehensive non-technical description of the IMPACT Project, see Powell [1977].

2. See Dixon, Parmenter, Ryland and Sutton [1977] (hereafter DPRS [1977]).

3. See Dixon, Parmenter, Powell and Vincent [1979] and Vincent, Dixon and Powell [1978].

orthodox. By devoting no more than a few hours to the task, a professional economist can acquire a detailed knowledge of how ORANI works.

We ask our colleagues to make such an investment of time and effort because we believe that ORANI can contribute significantly to the Australian economic policy debate. Already, in the last two years ORANI computations have been used in analyses of the effects on industries, occupations and regions of

(i) changes in tariffs[1],

(ii) the exploitation of mineral resources[2],

(iii) changes in world commodity prices[3],

(iv) changes in the exchange rate[4],

(v) the adoption of import parity pricing for oil products[5],

(vi) subsidies to ailing industries[6],

(vii) the move towards equal pay for women[7],

---

1. See Powell [1977, ch.4], DPRS [1977, ch.4], Dixon, Parmenter and Sutton [1977 and 1978a], Industries Assistance Commission [1977], Powell and Parmenter [1979], Dixon, Parmenter and Powell [1978] and Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, chs.3 and 5].

2. See Dixon, Harrower and Powell [1977], Powell and Parmenter [1979], Dixon, Parmenter and Sutton [1978b] and Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, ch.4].

3. See Dixon, Harrower and Powell [1977], Dixon, Parmenter and Sutton [1978b] and Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, ch.4].

4. See Powell [1977, ch.4], DPRS [1977, ch.4] and Dixon, Parmenter and Sutton [1977].

5. See Vincent, Dixon, Parmenter and Sams [1979].

6. See Dixon, Harrower and Powell [1977].

7. See Dixon, Parmenter and Sutton [1978b].

(viii) changes in real wages[1], and

(ix) the adoption of Keynesian demand stimulation policies.[2]

Many of the potential applications with the existing model await attention. At the same time, model extensions and improvements would deepen the present applications and open up new questions for analysis. There is, now, an urgent need to increase the number of people who can (a) appreciate the strengths and limitations of policy conclusions based on ORANI computations, (b) use the model in their own research, and (c) introduce model revisions and additions.

In this paper we try to increase the accessibility of ORANI by working through a miniature version. We describe the data base, theory, computational method and an application of MO 78 (Miniature ORANI 78). MO 78 leaves out investment, government spending, production taxes and subsidies, agricultural land and technological change. It recognizes only one type of labour and two industries. It fails to model demands for margins or to distinguish between purchasers' and producers' prices. It uses a fictitious data base and overly restrictive specifications of various substitution possibilities. Nevertheless, we feel that MO 78 is a useful model of a model. It simplifies ORANI 78 while retaining the main ideas intact. In particular, we hope that MO 78 gives readers a rapid understanding (unencumbered by the detail of ORANI 78) of each of the following :

---

1. See Dixon, Parmenter and Sutton [1978b], Dixon, Parmenter and Powell [1978] and Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, ch.3].

2. See Dixon, Parmenter and Powell [1978] and Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, ch.3].

(a) the way in which standard microeconomic theory (cost minimizing, utility maximizing,etc.) underlies the ORANI structural equations,

(b) ORANI's use of multiproduct and nested production functions and nested utility functions,

(c) the role of input-output data in the estimation of ORANI parameters,

(d) the computational procedures and the advantages and disadvantages of linearization in the ORANI context,

(e) the way in which model flexibility is enhanced by allowing variables to be shuffled between the endogenous and exogenous categories, and

(f) some of the principal mechanisms explaining the ORANI results.

The paper is organized in six sections. First we describe the input-output data base of MO 78. Then in section 2 we set out the theoretical structure. As the theory is developed, we refer back to the input-output data to show how the coefficients in each equation are estimated. The complete numerical representation of MO 78 is contained in Table 1. In the third section we discuss the selection of endogenous and exogenous variables. We argue that by leaving this selection to model users we increase considerably the model's applicability. Section 4 works through a computational example with MO 78. The results are interpreted and used to highlight some of the implications of the model's underlying theory. In the fifth section we offer some comments on computational theory, reminding readers of the costs and benefits from ORANI's use of linear approximations. The final section contains brief concluding remarks.

Throughout the paper we relate each part (the data, the theory, the computations and the results) of MO 78 to the corresponding part in ORANI 78. Our hope is that the documentation (as it is completed) on ORANI 78 will provide no mysteries for those who have worked through MO 78. In the meantime, readers who are familiar with MO 78 should have no difficulty in understanding results from ORANI 78.[1]

1. Papers containing results of ORANI 78 simulations include Vincent, Dixon, Parmenter and Sams [1979] and Dixon, Parmenter, Powell and Vincent [1979].

1. THE INPUT-OUTPUT DATA BASE

Figure 1 sets out schematically the input-output data required for MO 78. The data refer to flows in a particular year, the base year. Matrix $\tilde{A}$ shows the flows of the g domestically produced commodities into the h industries.[1] $\tilde{B}$ and $\tilde{C}$ are vectors showing domestic commodity flows to households and exports. $\tilde{D}$ and $\tilde{E}$ refer to flows of imported commodities to industries and households. $\tilde{Z}$ is the vector showing the negative of duty paid on imports. If we add across $\tilde{D}$, $\tilde{E}$ and $\tilde{Z}$ we obtain the foreign currency costs (in $A) of imported commodities. $\tilde{G}$ and $\tilde{H}$ are row vectors showing payments to labour and rentals on capital in each industry. $\tilde{J}$ is a matrix showing the commodity composition of each industry's output. If we add down a column of $\tilde{J}$ we obtain the total value of an industry's output. This could also be computed by adding down the appropriate column of $\tilde{A}$, $\tilde{D}$, $\tilde{G}$ and $\tilde{H}$. If we add across a row of $\tilde{J}$, we obtain the economy's output of a particular commodity. Alternatively, we can obtain commodity outputs by adding across the rows of $\tilde{A}$, $\tilde{B}$ and $\tilde{C}$.

Our base year for the ORANI 78 input-output data is 1968/9. The data are derived mainly from the ABS input-output tables for that year.[2] The data base includes, of course, many more categories of flows than are shown in Figure 1. Figure 1 simplifies the ORANI 78 input-output data base by excluding commodity flows to investment by industry, to the government and to "other" final demands. Figure 1 also

1. The matrices and vectors in Figure 1 are marked with tildes in the hope of avoiding confusion with notation appearing elsewhere in the paper.

2. See Australian Bureau of Statistics [1977].

Figure 1 : Schematic Input-Output Data Base for MO 78

		Industries	Households	Exports	- Duty	Row totals
		← h →	← 1 →	← 1 →	← 1 →	
Domestic	↑ g ↓	$\tilde{A}$	$\tilde{B}$	$\tilde{C}$		Commodity outputs
Imports	↑ g ↓	$\tilde{D}$	$\tilde{E}$		$\tilde{Z}$	Foreign currency cost of commodity imports
Labour	↑ 1 ↓	$\tilde{G}$				Payments to labour
Capital	↑ 1 ↓	$\tilde{H}$				Payments to capital
		Total industry outputs	Total household consumption	Total exports	Total duty	
Commodities	↑ g ↓	$\tilde{J}$				Commodity outputs

omits demands for commodities (or services) to be used as margins, e.g.,transport, wholesale and retail trade services. Finally, Figure 1 shows no disaggregation of labour inputs, no land inputs and no miscellaneous "other" inputs. Nevertheless, Figure 1 will, we hope, be adequate to illustrate the ORANI 78 input-output data base and its role in parameter estimation.

For our illustrative model it will be convenient to assume that $h = 2$ and $g = 2$.[1] Thus our model will have only 2 industries and 4 commodities (2 domestically produced commodities and 2 imported). This will allow us to carry along a numerical example while we explain the MO 78 theory. We will assume that the input-output data base for MO 78 is as shown in Figure 2. The numbers in Figure 2 are Australian dollar amounts for the base year, say 1968/9. It is worth pointing out that our data reflects a base period balance of trade deficit of \$A1. The foreign currency cost of imports is 9 + 12 = 21, while the foreign currency value of exports is 19 + 1 = 20. Alternatively, we can calculate the balance of trade deficit as absorption minus GDP, i.e., household consumption (62) - factor payments (55) - duty (6).

---

1. In standard runs of ORANI 78, $h = 113$ and $g = 115$.

Figure 2 : Input-Output Data Base for MO 78, Numerical Example

		Industries 1	Industries 2	Households	Exports	-Duty	Row totals
Domestic	1	10	8	17	19		54
	2	15	1	34	1		51
Imports	1	1	8	1		-1	9
	2	5	2	10		-5	12
Labour		20	20				40
Capital		10	5				15
		61	44				
Commodity outputs	1	45	9				54
	2	16	35				51
				62	20		

2. THE THEORETICAL STRUCTURE

ORANI can be placed in the Johansen class of models.[1] Johansen type models are characterised by all the equations being linear in percentage changes of the variables. Rather than writing

$$Y = f(X_1, X_2) , \tag{2.1}$$

where Y is output and X_1 and X_2 are inputs, in a Johansen model we use the linear percentage change form

$$y - \varepsilon_1 x_1 - \varepsilon_2 x_2 = 0 , \tag{2.2}$$

where ε_i is the elasticity of output with respect to inputs of factor i, and y, x_1 and x_2 are percentage changes in Y, X_1 and X_2.

In matrix notation, a Johansen model can be represented by

$$Az = 0 , \tag{2.3}$$

where A is a matrix of elasticities and z is the vector of percentage changes in model variables. For MO 78, A is a 39×52 matrix (see Table 1), i.e., MO 78 has 39 equations and 52 variables.

Because the A matrix is assumed fixed, (2.3) provides only a local representation of the equations suggested by economic theory. For example, (2.2) is valid only for "small" changes in X_1 and X_2. This disadvantage must be weighed against the computational advantages and flexibility of linear models. We return to this issue in section 5.

---

1. So named in recognition of the contribution of Johansen [1960]. See also, Taylor and Black [1974], Klijn [1974] and Staelin [1976].

The equations of a typical Johansen model can be classified into five groups :

I. equations describing household and other final demands for commodities,

II. equations describing industry demands for primary factor and intermediate inputs,

III. pricing equations setting "pure" profits from all activities to zero,

IV. market clearing equations for primary factors and commodities, and

V. miscellaneous definitional equations, e.g., equations defining GDP, aggregate employment, the consumer price index, etc. .

In presenting the theory of MO 78, we will use this five part classification. However, one additional set of equations -- those describing the commodity composition of industry outputs -- will be required. MO 78 recognizes multiproduct production functions for industries. Therefore, in MO 78, industries have output-composition decisions. This aspect of MO 78 will be treated under heading II, i.e., it will be convenient to extend this heading to include the equations explaining the composition of industry outputs as well as those explaining the composition of industry inputs.

A note on notation

In describing MO 78, we will observe the following notational conventions.

(a) The percentage change in any variable V will be represented by v,

$$\text{i.e.,} \quad v = \frac{dV}{V}\,100 \quad .$$

(b) $X_{(is)j}$ will denote the demand by user j for input i of type s. The possible values for subscript i are 1, 2 and 3. Where i equals 1 and 2 we refer to commodities 1 and 2 and where i is 3 we refer to primary factors. s can take the values 1 and 2. In the context of commodities, $s = 1$ means domestic while $s = 2$ means imported. Thus the subscript (12) indicates imported good 1. The subscript (21) indicates domestically produced good 2, etc.. In the context of primary factors ($i = 3$), $s = 1$ means labour while $s = 2$ means capital. The subscript (32), for example, should be read as primary factor type 2 -- that is capital. The subscript j has 4 possible values: j equals 1 and 2 refer to industries 1 and 2, $j = 3$ refers to households while $j = 4$ refers to exports. A few examples should clarify matters :

$X_{(12)1}$ = demand for imported good 1 to be used as an input into industry 1,

$X_{(11)4}$ = export volume for domestically produced good 1,

$X_{(21)3}$ = demand for domestically produced good 2 by households,

$X_{(31)2}$ = demand for primary factor type 1, i.e., labour, by industry 2.

Not all possible combinations of subscript values define valid MO 78 variables. For example, readers will not find $X_{(12)4}$, $X_{(31)3}$ or $X_{(31)4}$ appearing in MO 78. This is because we assume that imported commodities are not simply re-exported, we assume that households do not use primary factors, and we assume that primary factors are not exported.

(c) Commodity outputs from our two industries will be denoted by $Y_{(i1)j}$, where both i and j can take the values 1 and 2. Thus, $Y_{(11)2}$ is the output of domestically produced good 1 by industry 2. Naturally, our industries can only produce domestic commodities. The symbol $Y_{(12)j}$ has no meaning in MO 78. Consequently, we could delete the "type" subscript on the Y's. We prefer to retain it, however, so that the subscript (is) immediately indicates good or factor i of type s. If this subscript is appended do an X, we are defining a demand. If it is appended to a Y, we are defining a production level. If it is appended to a P, we are defining a price.

2.1 Household and other final demands

(a) Household demands

We explain household demands via utility maximizing. For our illustrative model, MO 78, we will assume that the utility function takes the nested form

$$U = \min \left\{ \frac{X_{(1.)3}}{A_{(1.)3}}, \frac{X_{(2.)3}}{A_{(2.)3}} \right\}, \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$X_{(i.)3} = X_{(i1)3}^{\alpha_{(i1)3}} \; X_{(i2)3}^{\alpha_{(i2)3}}, \qquad i=1,2, \tag{2.5}$$

and the A's and α's are positive parameters with $\alpha_{(i1)3} + \alpha_{(i2)3} = 1$, for i equals 1 and 2. The specification (2.4) - (2.5) implies that consumers derive utility from "effective" units of goods 1 and 2, where an effective unit of good i is an aggregation of commodities (i1) and (i2), i.e., an effective unit of good i is an aggregation of units of domestically produced good i and units of imported good i .[1] The aggregation is defined by equation (2.5). In the particular case set out here, the household sector is assumed to behave as if effective units of goods 1 and 2 are non-substitutes -- (2.4) has the Leontief form. On the other hand, units of imported and domestic commodity i substitute for each other (with unitary elasticity) in the creation of effective units good i -- (2.5) has the Cobb-Douglas form. Of course, (2.4) and (2.5) can take more empirically relevant forms. The equations corresponding to these in ORANI have, respectively, nested additive[2] and CES forms.[3] Equations (2.4) and (2.5) are adequate, however, for illustrative purposes.

The next step is to introduce the household budget constraint,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{s=1}^{2} P_{(is)} X_{(is)3} = C , \qquad (2.6)$$

where $P_{(is)}$ is the price in the domestic market for commodity (is), and C is the household sector's aggregate expenditure level. Notice that the prices $(P_{(is)}, i,s=1,2)$ carry no user subscript. In this illustrative model we will abstract from complications caused by the distinction between purchasers' and producers' prices. This distinction (caused by transport, sales taxes and other margins costs)

---

1. The idea of using nested utility functions to handle substitution possibilities between domestic and imported commodities is found in Armington [1969, 1970]. See also Artus and Rhomberg [1973], Dixon [1976] and Dervis [1978].

2. Estimates of the parameters for the nested additive utility function are in Tulpulé and Powell [1978].

3. The estimation of the substitution elasticities between imported and domestic commodities and the supporting data base are described in Alaouze [1976, 1977a, 1977b], Alaouze, Marsden and Zeitsch [1977] and Marsden and Milkovits [1977].

is not of great theoretical interest. On the other hand, it is of practical importance and receives detailed treatment in the ORANI model.[1]

On maximizing (2.4) subject to (2.5) and (2.6) we can derive the household demand functions. It is rather laborious to obtain their explicit forms and it will be sufficient to denote them by

$$X_{(is)3} = X_{(is)3}\,(P, C)\ , \qquad i,s=1,2\ , \tag{2.7}$$

where P is the vector of commodity prices.

In linear percentage change form, (2.7) becomes

$$x_{(is)3} = \varepsilon_{(is)}c + \sum_{q=1}^{2} \sum_{r=1}^{2} \eta_{(is)(qr)}\, p_{(qr)}\ , \quad i,s=1,2, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\varepsilon_{(is)}$ is the expenditure[2] elasticity of demand for good i of type s . For example, $\varepsilon_{(12)}$ is the expenditure elasticity of demand for imported good 1. $\eta_{(is)(qr)}$ is the cross price elasticity of demand for good i of type s with respect to changes in the price of good q of type r . For example, $\eta_{(12)(21)}$ is the cross elasticity between imported good 1 and domestic good 2.

With the particular utility specification (2.4) - (2.5), it is clear that

$$\varepsilon_{(is)} = 1\ , \qquad \text{for all } i \text{ and } s\ . \tag{2.9}$$

The utility function is homothetic (in fact it is homogeneous of degree 1)

---

1. See DPRS [1977], sections 8, 9 and 16.

2. C is the household expenditure level. Therefore, the ε's are expenditure elasticities, not income elasticities.

and therefore, in the absence of price changes, a one per cent increase total expenditure will be allocated as a one per cent increase in expenditure on each commodity.

For the price elasticities, we have the well known Hicks-Slutsky partition -- total effect equals income effect plus substitution effect, i.e.,

$$\eta_{(is)(qr)} = -\varepsilon_{(is)} S_{(qr)3} + \bar{\eta}_{(is)(qr)}, \quad i,s,q,r=1,2, \tag{2.10}$$

where $S_{(qr)3}$ is the share of the total household budget devoted to commodity (qr), and $\bar{\eta}_{(is)(qr)}$ is the <u>compensated</u> cross elasticity of demand for (is) with respect to changes in price (qr). With utility held constant, (2.4) implies that changes in the prices of domestic or imported good 1 will not affect the demands for domestic or imported good 2, and <u>vice versa</u>. Hence

$$\bar{\eta}_{(is)(qr)} = 0, \quad \text{if } i \neq q .$$

On the other hand, with utility held constant at $\bar{U}$ say, $X_{(i1)3}$ and $X_{(i2)3}$ will be chosen to minimize

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &\sum_{s=1}^{2} P_{(is)} X_{(is)3}, \\ \text{subject to} \quad &\prod_{s=1}^{2} X_{(is)3}^{\alpha_{(is)3}} = A_{(i.)3}\bar{U} . \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.11}$$

The first order conditions for a solution of this problem are

$$P_{(is)} X_{(is)3} - \Lambda \alpha_{(is)3} (A_{(i.)3}\bar{U}) = 0, \quad s=1,2, \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$\prod_{s=1}^{2} X_{(is)3}^{\alpha_{(is)3}} = A_{(i.)3}\bar{U}, \tag{2.13}$$

where Λ is the Lagrangian multiplier. Holding utility constant, and linearizing these first order conditions, we obtain

$$p_{(is)} + x_{(is)3} = \lambda , \qquad s=1,2 ,$$

and

$$\sum_{s=1}^{2} \alpha_{(is)3}\, x_{(is)3} = 0 .$$

When we eliminate λ , we find that

$$\bar{\eta}_{(is)(is)} = -1 + \alpha_{(is)3} , \qquad s=1,2 ,$$

and

$$\bar{\eta}_{(is)(ir)} = \alpha_{(ir)3} , \text{ where } \quad r \neq s .$$

We also note from (2.12) that the α's are expenditure shares. $\alpha_{(is)3}$ is the share of good (is) in the households' total expenditure on good i . Thus, from our input-output data base (Figure 2) we can compute the compensated price elasticities :

$$\bar{\eta}_{(11)(11)} = -1 + 17/18 = -.06 \qquad \bar{\eta}_{(21)(21)} = -1 + 34/44 = -.23$$

$$\bar{\eta}_{(11)(12)} = 1/18 = .06 \qquad \bar{\eta}_{(21)(22)} = 10/44 = .23$$

$$\bar{\eta}_{(12)(12)} = -1 + 1/18 = -.94 \qquad \bar{\eta}_{(22)(22)} = -1 + 10/44 = -.77$$

$$\bar{\eta}_{(12)(11)} = 17/18 = .94 \qquad \bar{\eta}_{(22)(21)} = 34/44 = .77 .$$

Now we combine these calculations with formulae (2.9) and (2.10) to obtain the uncompensated elasticities. For example

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{(11)(11)} &= -\varepsilon_{(11)} S_{(11)3} + \bar{\eta}_{(11)(11)} \\ &= -1 \times 17/62 - .06 \\ &= -0.33 . \end{aligned}$$

Readers who are interested in following the arithmetical example further can read the elasticities from the first four rows of Table 1. These rows display the household demand equations (2.8) in their computational form, given the utility maximizing model (2.4) - (2.6) and the data base shown in Figure 2. For example, row 1 in Table 1 should be read as

$$1.00x_{(11)3} - 1.00c + 0.33p_{(11)} - 0.04p_{(12)} + 0.55p_{(21)} + 0.16p_{(22)} = 0 ,$$

$$\text{i.e., } x_{(11)3} = \varepsilon_{(11)}c + \sum_{q=1}^{2}\sum_{r=1}^{2} \eta_{(11)(qr)}\, p_{(qr)} ,$$

where $\eta_{(11)(11)} = -0.33$, $\eta_{(11)(12)} = 0.04$, $\eta_{(12)(21)} = -0.55$,

$\eta_{(11)(22)} = -0.16$, and $\varepsilon_{(11)} = 1$.

(b) Exports

We write the export demand functions as

$$P^*_{(i1)} = X_{(i1)4}^{-\gamma_i} F_{(i1)4} , \qquad i=1,2 , \tag{2.14}$$

where $P^*_{(i1)}$ is the foreign currency price of domestic good i , $X_{(i1)4}$ is the export volume, γ_i is a positive parameter (the reciprocal of the foreign elasticity of demand) and $F_{(i1)4}$ is a "shift" variable. For example, if there is an increase in foreign demand, i.e., an upward movement in the demand curve, then $F_{(i1)4}$ increases.

In linear percentage change form (2.14) becomes

$$p^*_{(i1)} = - \gamma_i\, x_{(i1)4} + f_{(i1)4} , \qquad i=1,2 . \tag{2.15}$$

In Table 1, (2.15) is shown in its computational form in rows 5 and 6. The values choosen for γ_1 and γ_2 are 0.50 and 0.05 respectively, i.e., the foreign elasticity of demand for good 1 is 2.0 while that for good 2 is 20.0 . Values such as these are typical of the ORANI data base. For example, in recent ORANI computations the foreign elasticity of demand for Australian wool has been set at 1.3, while that for minor export products has been set at 20.[1]

2.2 Industry inputs and outputs

We imagine that industry production functions can be expressed as

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &G_j\left(Y_{(11)j},\ Y_{(21)j}\right) = Z_j\ , && (2.16)\\ \text{and}\quad &H_j\left(X_{(11)j},X_{(12)j},X_{(21)j},X_{(22)j},X_{(31)j},X_{(32)j}\right) = Z_j, && (2.17)\end{aligned}\right\}\ j=1,2,$$

or more compactly as

$$G_j(Y^j) = Z_j\ ,$$

and

$$H_j(X^j) = Z_j\ ,$$

where Y^j is the vector of outputs of industry j and X^j is the vector of inputs. Z_j is a variable reflecting industry j's overall capacity to produce.

Industry j is viewed as buying a production possibilities frontier - more inputs yield a higher Z_j and a higher Z_j corresponds to an expanded production possibilities set (see Figure 3).

---

1. See DPRS [1977], p. 173 and Freebairn [1978].

Figure 3 : Production Possibilities Frontiers



Notice that under (2.16) - (2.17) inputs are regarded as non-specific to products. Inputs merely generate a general capacity to produce and this capacity can be used to produce a variety of products. For example, one can think of labour, tractors and fertilizer as being general farm inputs which allow production of various combinations of wheat, wool, cattle,etc.. In ORANI 78 the use of multiproduct production functions is, in fact, confined to six agricultural industries. The remaining 107 industries have single output production functions, i.e., for these industries

$$G_j(Y^j) = Y_{(r1)j} ,$$

where r is the commodity produced by industry j .

For our illustrative model, we will assume that the product transformation frontiers (2.16) have the form

$$\left(Y^2_{(11)j}\beta_{(11)j} + Y^2_{(21)j}\beta_{(21)j}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = Z_j , \quad j=1,2 , \tag{2.18}$$

where $\beta_{(11)j}$ and $\beta_{(21)j}$ are positive parameters. Under (2.18), the product transformation frontier is a quarter elipse. In our applied work on Australian agriculture we used the more general CRETH function to specify product transformation possibilities.[1] For our present purposes an advantage of (2.18) is that it implies comparatively straight-forward supply relations.[2] We generate the supply relations for industry j by considering the problem of choosing $Y_{(11)j}$ and $Y_{(21)j}$ to maximize

$$P_{(11)}Y_{(11)j} + P_{(21)}Y_{(21)j} ,$$

subject to (2.18).

---

1. See Vincent, Dixon and Powell [1978].

2. That is, equations of the form

$$Y_{(i1)j} = Y_{(i1)j}\left(P_{(11)}, P_{(21)}, Z_j\right), \quad i,j=1,2 . \tag{2.19}$$

The first order conditions for this problem are

$$P_{(i1)} - \Lambda Z_j^{-1}\beta_{(i1)j}Y_{(i1)j} = 0 , \quad i=1,2 , \qquad (2.20)$$

and

$$\left(Y^2_{(11)j}\beta_{(11)j} + Y^2_{(21)j}\beta_{(21)j}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = Z_j , \qquad (2.21)$$

where Λ is the Lagrangian multiplier. In linear percentage change form we have

$$p_{(i1)} = \lambda - z_j + y_{(i1)j} , \qquad i=1,2 , \qquad (2.22)$$

and

$$y_{(11)j}R_{(11)j} + y_{(21)j}R_{(21)j} = z_j , \qquad (2.23)$$

where

$$R_{(i1)j} = Y^2_{(i1)j}\beta_{(i1)j}\Big/\left(Y^2_{(11)j}\beta_{(11)j} + Y^2_{(21)j}\beta_{(21)j}\right) .$$

From (2.20) we see that the $R_{(i1)j}$'s are revenue shares, i.e. ,

$$R_{(i1)j} = P_{(i1)}Y_{(i1)j}\Big/\left(P_{(11)}Y_{(11)j} + P_{(21)}Y_{(21)j}\right) , \quad i=1,2 . \qquad (2.24)$$

Next we eliminate λ from (2.22) - (2.23) to obtain the supply relations

$$y_{(i1)j} = z_j + \left(p_{(i1)} - \sum_{q=1}^{2} R_{(q1)j}p_{(q1)}\right) , \quad i=1,2 . \qquad (2.25)$$

Equation (2.25) says that, in the absence of price changes, the output of good (i1) by industry j will expand with the overall level of activity, Z_j , in industry j . However, if the price of good (i1) increases relative to the appropriately weighted average of prices $P_{(11)}$ and $P_{(21)}$, then industry j's output of good i will increase more quickly than Z_j , i.e., industry j will transform its product mix in favour of good i . With the particular equation (2.25), the elasticity of transformation between goods (11) and (21) in industry j is unity.[1] Under the more general CRETH specification for the transformation frontier, the elasticities of transformation between pairs of products are left as free parameters to be empirically determined.

The computational form of (2.25) is shown in Table 1, rows 7 - 10. The $R_{(q1)j}$'s are computed as column shares in the $\tilde{J}$ matrix (Figure 1). For example, with the data in Figure 2, we have $R_{(11)1} = 45/(45 + 16)$.

On the input side we assume that H_j has the form

$$\min \left\{ \frac{X_{(1.)j}}{A_{(1.)j}} , \frac{X_{(2.)j}}{A_{(2.)j}} , \frac{X_{(3.)j}}{A_{(3.)j}} \right\} = Z_j , \qquad (2.26)$$

where $X_{(1.)j}$ and $(X_{2.})_j$ are Cobb-Douglas combinations of inputs of goods 1 and 2 from domestic and foreign sources and $X_{(3.)j}$ is a Cobb-Douglas combination of primary factor inputs, labour and capital. More specifically

$$X_{(i.)j} = X_{(i1)j}^{\alpha_{(i1)j}} \; X_{(i2)j}^{\alpha_{(i2)j}} , \qquad i=1,2,3, \qquad (2.27)$$

where the α's are positive parameters summing to unity in each equation.[2] Under (2.26), no substitution is allowed between primary factors and intermediate inputs or between intermediate inputs of goods 1 and 2. On the other hand, domestically produced and imported inputs

---

1. See Vincent, Dixon and Powell [1978].

2. For definitions of the $X_{(qr)j}$'s , see "A note on notation" on page 11.

of each good i substitute with unitary elasticity (see (2.27)). Similarly, labour and capital can be substituted. Although the theory of ORANI allows for considerably more general specifications of H_j, in practice (2.26) - (2.27) is close to what is actually implemented. In fact, the only difference is that the Cobb-Douglas functions (2.27) are replaced by CES functions.

By assuming cost minimizing behavior, i.e., by assuming that industry j chooses $X_{(is)j}$, i=1,2,3 and s=1,2, to minimize

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{s=1}^{2} P_{(is)}X_{(is)j} + P_{(31)}X_{(31)j} + P_{(32)j}X_{(32)j} ,$$

subject to (2.26) and (2.27), we can obtain input demand functions of the form

$$X_{(is)j} = X_{(is)j}(P, P_{(31)}, P_{(32)j}, Z_j) , \quad i=1,2,3 \quad s=1,2, \qquad (2.28)$$

where P is (as in (2.7)) the vector of commodity prices, $P_{(31)}$ is the price of labour and $P_{(32)j}$ is the rental on the use of units of capital in industry j. Notice that we have no j subscript on the wage rate, $P_{(31)}$, while we do include a j subscript on the rental on capital. This is consistent with the assumption commonly made in ORANI computations that labour is mobile between industries but that capital is immobile. In other words, capital is industry specific and labour is not. Thus, labour will have an economy-wide price, while the rental value of any unit of capital will reflect conditions in the specific using industry.

Under the particular specification (2.26) - (2.27), the linear percentage change forms for the input demand functions are

$$\left.\begin{aligned} x_{(is)j} &= z_j - \left(p_{(is)} - \sum_{r=1}^{2} \alpha_{(ir)j} p_{(ir)}\right) , \quad i,s=1,2 , \\ x_{(31)j} &= z_j - \left(p_{(31)} - \left(\alpha_{(31)j} p_{(31)} + \alpha_{(32)j} p_{(32)j}\right)\right), \\ \text{and} \quad x_{(32)j} &= z_j - \left(p_{(32)j} - \left(\alpha_{(31)j} p_{(31)} + \alpha_{(32)j} p_{(32)j}\right)\right) . \end{aligned}\right\} \quad (2.29)$$

These equations are derived by considering problems similar to (2.11), where the 3's are replaced by j's and the right hand sides of the constraints become $A_{(i.)j}Z_j$ rather than $A_{(i.)3}\,\overline{U}$. The α's are again interpretable as shares. For example, $\alpha_{(is)j}$ is the share of commodity (is) in industry j's total expenditure on good i . Thus, from our input-output data we can compute

$$\alpha_{(11)1} = 10/11 , \quad \alpha_{(21)1} = 15/20 , \quad \text{etc..}$$

Rows 11 - 22 of Table 1 display the computational versions of the input demand functions for MO 78. Rows 11 - 16 cover the demands by industry 1 while rows 17 - 22 refer to demands by industry 2. For each industry, the demand equations are listed in the order (11), (12), (21), (22), (31), (32).

2.3 Zero pure profits for all activities

The activities recognized in our illustrative model are production, exporting and importing. The zero pure profits condition for production implies that

$$P_{(11)}Y_{(11)j} + P_{(21)}Y_{(21)j} = P_{(31)}X_{(31)j} + P_{(32)j}X_{(32)j} + \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{s=1}^{2} P_{(is)}X_{(is)j} \quad , \quad j=1,2, \qquad (2.30)$$

i.e., revenue in industry j equals costs in industry. It should be emphasized that such an equation does not rule out profits. It does rule out pure profits, i.e., profits not accruing to a factor of production. In models incorporating equations such as (2.30), variations in profits are simulated by variations in the $P_{(32)j}$'s . Adverse events in industry j will reduce the profitability of using capital in industry j , i.e., there will be reductions in the rental value, $P_{(32)j}$, of capital in industry j .

The second set of zero pure profit conditions in our illustrative model equates the revenue from exporting to the relevant costs, i.e.,

$$P^*_{(i1)} V_i \Phi = P_{(i1)} \quad , \quad i=1,2, \qquad (2.31)$$

where $P^*_{(i1)}$ is, as in equation (2.14), the foreign currency price of domestic good i . Φ is the exchange rate, \$A/\$Foreign, and V_i is one plus the ad valorem rate of export subsidy. Thus on the left of (2.31) we have the \$A value of exporting a unit of commodity i . On the right we have the cost of doing so, i.e., the domestic price of a unit of commodity i .

The final set of zero pure profit conditions equates the selling prices of imported commodities to the cost of importing, i.e.,

$$P_{(i2)} = P^*_{(i2)} T_i \Phi \quad , \quad i=1,2, \qquad (2.32)$$

where T_i is one plus the ad valorem rate of tariff on imports of good i and $P^*_{(i2)}$ is the foreign currency price.

In linear percentage change form, (2.30) becomes

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2}\left(p_{(i1)} + y_{(i1)j}\right)R_{(i1)j} = \left(p_{(31)} + x_{(31)j}\right)S_{(31)j} + \left(p_{(32)j} + x_{(32)j}\right)S_{(32)}{}^{j} + \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{s=1}^{2}\left(p_{(is)} + x_{(is)j}\right)S_{(is)j}\,, \qquad j=1,2, \tag{2.33}$$

where the $R_{(i1)j}$'s are revenue shares (defined in (2.24) and the $S_{(is)j}$'s are cost shares. For example, $S_{(12)1}$ is the share in industry 1's total costs accounted for by inputs of imported commodity 1. Given the data in Figure 2, this share would have the value 1/61.

Equation (2.33) can be simplified by recalling from (2.23) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} y_{(i1)j}R_{(i1)j} = z_j\,, \tag{2.34}$$

and observing from (2.29) that

$$\sum_{s=1}^{2} x_{(is)j}\alpha_{(is)j} = z_j\,, \qquad i=1,2,3\,. \tag{2.35}$$

On using (2.34) and (2.35) in (2.33) and on noting that

$$S_{(is)j} = \alpha_{(is)j}S_{(i.)j}\,, \qquad i=1,2,3\,,\quad s=1,2\,,$$

where $S_{(i.)j}$, i=1,2, is the share of the j's total costs represented by inputs of good i from both domestic and foreign sources and $S_{(3.)j}$

is the primary factor share, we see that (2.33) reduces to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} p_{(i1)}R_{(i1)j} = p_{(31)}S_{(31)j} + p_{(32)j}S_{(32)j} + \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{s=1}^{2} p_{(is)}S_{(is)j}, \qquad j=1,2 \quad . \tag{2.36}$$

Equation (2.36) says that an appropriately weighted average of the percentage changes in output prices equals an appropriately weighted average of the percentage changes in input prices. The fact that it has been possible to eliminate output and input quantities from (2.33) can be traced back to the assumption of constant returns to scale implied by the production specification (2.18) and (2.26) - (2.27). Under constant returns to scale unit costs are independent of the scale of output.

The linear percentage change forms for (2.31) and (2.32) are

$$p^*_{(i1)} + v_i + \phi = p_{(i1)}, \qquad i=1,2 , \tag{2.37}$$

and

$$p^*_{(i2)} + t_i + \phi = p_{(i2)}, \qquad i=1,2 \quad . \tag{2.38}$$

In Table 1, the computational forms for the zero pure profit equations (2.36) - (2.38) are shown in rows 23 - 28. The coefficients in equation (2.36) are computed from the input-output data in Figure 2. For example, the coefficient on $p_{(11)}$ in row 23 is

$$R_{(11)1} - S_{(11)1} = \frac{45}{61} - \frac{10}{61} = 0.57 \quad .$$

The coefficient on $P_{(12)}$ in row 24 is

$$- S_{(12)2} = - \frac{8}{44} = -0.18 \quad .$$

2.4 Market clearing for commodities and factors

For our two domestically produced commodities we have

$$Y_{(i1)1} + Y_{(i1)2} = \sum_{j=1}^{4} X_{(i1)j} , \qquad i=1,2, \tag{2.39}$$

i.e., the supply of domestic good i equals intermediate demand plus household demand plus export demand. In linear percentage change form (2.39) is written as

$$\sum_{j=1,2} y_{(i1)j}Q_{(i1)j} = \sum_{j=1}^{4} x_{(i1)j}W_{(i1)j} , \qquad i=1,2, \tag{2.40}$$

where the Q's are industry market shares for each commodity and the W's are shares of intermediate, household and export demand in aggregate commodity demands. For example, using the data in Figure 2, we have

$$Q_{(11)1} = 45/54 , \quad Q_{(11)2} = 9/54 ,$$

$$W_{(11)1} = 10/54 , \quad W_{(11)3} = 17/54 , \quad \text{etc.}.$$

The computational form for (2.40) is shown in rows 29 and 30 of Table 1.

The market clearing equations for primary factors are

$$X_{(31)1} + X_{(31)2} = L , \tag{2.41}$$

and

$$X_{(32)j} = K_j , \qquad j=1,2 . \tag{2.42}$$

L is the aggregate level of employment and $X_{(31)1}$ and $X_{(31)2}$ are labour demands in industries 1 and 2. Thus (2.41) amounts to saying that employment demands are satisfied -- aggregate employment, L , is the sum of labour demands in each industry. Equation (2.41) does not, of course, impose the full employment assumption on our model. Although we could set L exogenously at the full employment level, an obvious alternative would be to set the wage rate, $P_{(31)}$, exogenously and to let the model determine L . Under this latter specification, our assumption would be that the labour market is slack, i.e., supply constraints play no role in determining actual employment.

In equation (2.42), K_j is the employment of capital in industry j . For short-run applications one would normally set K_j exogenously to reflect the current availability of capital in industry j .[1] Thus, one would impose the assumption that capital stocks are fully employed. This does not exclude the phenomenon of excess capacity. Excess capacity can be interpreted as a situation in which capital stocks are being operated with less labour than was planned when those capital stocks were created. Unfavourable events from the point of view of industry j will decrease $X_{(31)j}/K_j$ but will not invalidate (2.42).

An important difference between equations (2.41) and (2.42) is that labour demands are added across industries, whereas for capital there is a separate market clearing equation for each industry. This once again reflects the assumption that labour is mobile across industries whereas capital is immobile. These assumptions are maintained in most ORANI simulations. There are, however, nine types of labour rather than one. Consequently, there are nine equations of the form (2.41).

1. Since MO 78 omits investment, it is perhaps difficult to imagine an application where the K_j's are endogenous. We consider this point in Section 3.

In linear percentage change form the market clearing equations for primary factors are

$$x_{(31)1}W_{(31)1} + x_{(31)2}W_{(31)2} = \ell ,$$

and

$$X_{(32)j} = k_j , \quad j=1,2, \qquad (2.43)$$

where $W_{(31)1}$ and $W_{(31)2}$ are the shares of total employment accounted for by industries 1 and 2. Because we assume that the wage rate is uniform across industries, it follows that employment is proportional to wage payments. Therefore, $W_{(31)1}$ and $W_{(31)2}$ can be computed from Figure 2 as

$$W_{(31)1} = 20/40 \quad \text{and} \quad W_{(31)2} = 20/40 \quad .$$

The computational forms for (2.43) appear in rows 31-33 of Table 1.

2.5 Other useful equations

The ORANI model contains many equations which are designed to facilitate applications. Some of these define summary variables, e.g., the consumer price index, GDP and the balance of trade. Other equations allow for institutional factors, e.g., wage indexation. For our illustrative model, we will append six examples :

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^{2} P^*_{(i2)}\left(X_{(i2)1} + X_{(i2)2} + X_{(i2)3}\right) , \qquad (2.44)$$

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^{2} P^*_{(i1)}X_{(i1)4} , \qquad (2.45)$$

$$B = E - M , \qquad (2.46)$$

$$CPI = \prod_{i=1}^{2} \prod_{s=1}^{2} P_{(is)}^{S_{(is)3}} , \qquad (2.47)$$

$$P_{(31)} = (CPI)^h F_{(31)} , \qquad (2.48)$$

and

$$C_R = C/CPI . \qquad (2.49)$$

Equations (2.44) - (2.46) define the foreign currency values of imports (M) , exports (E) and the balance of trade (B) . Equation (2.47) defines the consumer price index. The $S_{(is)3}$'s are the weights. They are defined as in (2.10), i.e., $S_{(is)3}$ is the share of the total household budget devoted to commodity (is) . Equation (2.48) allows for wage indexation. For example, if the parameter h is set at unity and the wage-shift variable $F_{(31)}$ is held constant, then wages will move with the CPI, i.e., we will be simulating a situation of 100 per cent wage indexation. Exogenous shifts in real wages can be introduced via changes in $F_{(31)}$ and partial wage indexation can be handled by setting h at less than one. The final equation (2.49), defines real household expenditure, C_R .

In linear percentage change form (2.44) is written as

$$m = \sum_{i=1}^{2} N_{(i2)} \left(p^*_{(i2)} + x_{(i2)1} W_{(i2)1} + x_{(i2)2} W_{(i2)2} + x_{(i2)3} W_{(i2)3} \right) , \qquad (2.50)$$

where $N_{(i2)}$ is the share of commodity (i2) in total imports. The data in Figure 2 implies that

$$N_{(12)} = 9/(9+12) \quad \text{and} \quad N_{(22)} = 12/(9+12) .$$

The $W_{(i2)j}$'s are the shares of imports of good (i2) going to industries and households. From the data in Figure 2, we have

$$W_{(12)1} = 1/(1 + 8 + 1) , \quad W_{(12)2} = 8/10 , \quad \text{etc..}$$

The linear percentage change form for (2.45) is

$$e = \sum_{i=1}^{2} N_{(i1)} \left(p^*_{(i1)} + x_{(i1)4}\right) , \tag{2.51}$$

where $N_{(i1)}$ is the share of commodity (i1) in total exports. From Figure 2, we have[1]

$$N_{(11)} = 19/20 \quad \text{and} \quad N_{(21)} = 1/20 .$$

In the case of the balance of trade equation, (2.46), a strict linear percentage change form is inappropriate. The problem is that B may move through zero and so the percentage change in B may become undefined. In our computations we use the variable ΔB, the <u>change</u> (not the percentage change) in the balance of trade. Thus, we rewrite (2.46) as

$$\Delta B = (Ee - Mm) \frac{1}{100} , \tag{2.52}$$

where E and M are the base period values for exports and imports. One minor disadvantage of (2.52) is that it requires us to keep track of the units of ΔB. In Table 1, row 36, we have used base period local currency values for E and M, i.e., $E = 20$ and $M = 21$ (see Figure 2). Thus, ΔB is the change in the balance of trade in terms of \$A of the base period.

The linear percentage change forms for the final three equations are :

$$cpi = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{s=1}^{2} S_{(is)3} p_{(is)} , \tag{2.53}$$

1. We assume that there are no export subsidies in the base period. Therefore, the export column in Figure 2 reflects foreign currency values.

$$p_{(31)} = h(cpi) + f_{(31)} , \tag{2.54}$$

and

$$c_R = c - cpi . \tag{2.55}$$

The computational versions of these three equations, together with those for the aggregate trade equations (2.50)-(2.52), are in rows 34 - 39 of Table 1. It will seem from row 38 that we have set the wage-indexing parameter h at 1. Thus, $f_{(31)}$ becomes the percentage change in real wages.

Table 1 : The A Matrix for MO 78, Az = 0. Columns 1 - 17

Row Nos.	Equations numbers and descriptions \ Variable names and descriptions (Column Nos.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	Row Nos.
		Household demands				Household expenditure level	Commodity prices (local currency)				Commodity prices (foreign currency)				Exports		Shifts in foreign demand		
		$x_{(11)3}$	$x_{(12)3}$	$x_{(21)3}$	$x_{(22)3}$	c	$p_{(11)}$	$p_{(12)}$	$p_{(21)}$	$p_{(22)}$	$p^*_{(11)}$	$p^*_{(21)}$	$p^*_{(12)}$	$p^*_{(22)}$	$x_{(11)4}$	$x_{(21)4}$	$f_{(11)4}$	$f_{(21)4}$	
1	Household demands (2.8)	1.00				-1.00	0.33	-0.04	0.55	0.16									1
2			1.00			-1.00	-0.57	0.96	0.55	0.16									2
3				1.00		-1.00	0.27	0.02	0.78	-0.07									3
4					1.00	-1.00	0.27	0.02	-0.22	0.93									4
5	Export demands (2.15)										1.00				0.50		-1.00		5
6												1.00				0.05		-1.00	6
7	Commodity outputs by industry (2.25)						-0.26		0.26										7
8							0.74		-0.74										8
9							-0.80		0.80										9
10							0.20		-0.20										10
11	Industry demands for primary factors and intermediate inputs (2.29)						0.09	-0.09											11
12							-0.91	0.91											12
13									0.25	-0.25									13
14									-0.75	0.75									14
15																			15
16																			16
17							0.50	-0.50											17
18							-0.50	0.50											18
19									0.67	-0.67									19
20									-0.33	0.33									20
21																			21
22																			22
23	Zero pure profits in production (2.36)						0.57	-0.02	0.02	-0.08									23
24							0.02	-0.18	0.77	-0.05									24
25	Zero pure profits in exporting (2.37)						-1.00				1.00								25
26									-1.00			1.00							26
27	Zero pure profits in importing (2.38)							-1.00					1.00						27
28										-1.00				1.00					28
29	Market clearing for domestic commodities (2.40)	-0.31													-0.35				29
30				-0.67												-0.02			30
31	Market clearing for primary factors (2.43)																		31
32																			32
33																			33
34	Imports (2.50)		-0.04		-0.33								-0.43	-0.57					34
35	Exports (2.51)										-0.95	-0.05			-0.95	-0.05			35
36	Balance of trade (2.52)																		36
37	CPI (2.53)						-0.27	-0.02	-0.55	-0.16									37
38	Wage rate (2.54)																		38
39	Real consumption (2.55)					-1.00													39

continued/-

Table 1 (contd) Columns 18 - 35

Col. Nos / Row Nos	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	
	Industry activity levels		Commodity outputs by industry				Intermediate and primary factor demands by industry												
	z_1	z_2	$y_{(11)1}$	$y_{(21)1}$	$y_{(11)2}$	$y_{(21)2}$	$x_{(11)1}$	$x_{(12)1}$	$x_{(21)1}$	$x_{(22)1}$	$x_{(31)1}$	$x_{(32)1}$	$x_{(11)2}$	$x_{(12)2}$	$x_{(21)2}$	$x_{(22)2}$	$x_{(31)2}$	$x_{(32)2}$	Row Nos
1																			1
2																			2
3																			3
4																			4
5																			5
6																			6
7	-1.00		1.00																7
8	-1.00			1.00															8
9		-1.00			1.00														9
10		-1.00				1.00													10
11	-1.00						1.00												11
12	-1.00							1.00											12
13	-1.00								1.00										13
14	-1.00									1.00									14
15	-1.00										1.00								15
16	-1.00											1.00							16
17		-1.00											1.00						17
18		-1.00												1.00					18
19		-1.00													1.00				19
20		-1.00														1.00			20
21		-1.00															1.00		21
22		-1.00																1.00	22
23																			23
24																			24
25																			25
26																			26
27																			27
28																			28
29			0.83		0.17		-0.19						-0.15						29
30				0.31		0.69			-0.29						-0.02				30
31											0.50						0.50		31
32												1.00							32
33																		1.00	33
34								-0.04		-0.17				-0.35		-0.07			34
35																			35
36																			36
37																			37
38																			38
39																			39

continued/-

Table 1 (contd) Columns 36 - 52

Col. Nos	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	
	Factor prices			Exchange rate	One plus rate of export subsidy		One plus rate of import duty		Factor employment levels			Aggregate imports, exports and the balance of trade			Aggregate prices	Wage shift	Real consumption	
Row Nos	$p_{(31)}$	$p_{(32)1}$	$p_{(32)2}$	ϕ	v_1	v_2	t_1	t_2	ℓ	k_1	k_2	m	e	ΔB	cpi	$f_{(31)}$	c_R	Row Nos
1																		1
2																		2
3																		3
4																		4
5																		5
6																		6
7																		7
8																		8
9																		9
10																		10
11																		11
12																		12
13																		13
14																		14
15	0.33	-0.33																15
16	-0.67	0.67																16
17																		17
18																		18
19																		19
20																		20
21	0.20		-0.20															21
22	-0.80		0.80															22
23	-0.33	-0.16																23
24	-0.45		-0.11															24
25				1.00	1.00													25
26				1.00		1.00												26
27				1.00			1.00											27
28				1.00				1.00										28
29																		29
30																		30
31									-1.00									31
32										-1.00								32
33											-1.00							33
34												1.00						34
35													1.00					35
36												0.21	-0.20	1.00				36
37															1.00			37
38	1.00														-1.00	-1.00		38
39															1.00		1.00	39

3. THE CHOICE OF ENDOGENOUS AND EXOGENOUS VARIABLES

We recall from the beginning of section 2 that a Johansen model can be represented by

$$Az = 0 , \qquad (3.1)$$

where A is an $m \times n$ matrix of coefficients and z is an $n \times 1$ vector of variables. In section 2 we derived the A matrix for the illustrative model MO 78 and set out the result in Table 1. It can be seen from Table 1 that the A matrix for MO 78 has 39 rows and 52 columns, i.e., $m = 39$ and $n = 52$. Thus to solve this model

$$n - m = 13$$

variables must be declared exogenous.

Once the choice of exogenous variables has been made, (3.1) is rewritten as

$$A_1 z_1 + A_2 z_2 = 0 , \qquad (3.2)$$

where A_1 is the 39×39 matrix formed by the 39 columns of A corresponding to the endogenous variables and A_2 is the 39×13 matrix formed by the 13 columns of A corresponding to the exogenous variables. z_1 and z_2 are, respectively, the 39×1 and 13×1 vectors of endogenous and exogenous variables.

Provided that A_1 is invertible,[1] we can proceed from (3.2) to the solution

$$z_1 = Bz_2 , \qquad (3.3)$$

1. We offer no formal theory on the conditions under which A_1 will be invertible. Experience suggests, however, that A_1 will be invertible for all "sensible" classifications of variables between the exogenous and endogenous categories. We return to this issue at the end of this section.

where B is the 39×13 matrix defined by

$$B = -A_1^{-1} A_2 \quad . \tag{3.4}$$

Equation (3.3) expresses the percentage change[1] in each endogenous variable as a linear function of the percentage changes in the 13 exogenous variables. We note that B_{ij} is the elasticity of the i^{th} endogenous variable with respect to changes in the j^{th} exogenous variable. For example, B_{ij} could be the percentage change in employment in industry 2 arising from a one per cent increase in the foreign currency price of imported commodity 1. If B_{21} had the value 1.2, say, this would be interpreted as meaning that a one per cent increase in the foreign currency price of imported good 1 would cause employment in industry 2 to be 1.2 per cent higher than it otherwise would have been.

The 13 exogenous variables can be chosen in many different ways. In Table 2 we have given one possibility. Under this choice, the A_2 matrix is formed from Table 1 by selecting columns 12, 13, 15-17, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 51, 52, while the A_1 matrix is made up of columns 1-11, 14, 18-38, 41, 44, 47-50. In Table 3, we have presented selected rows and columns of the solution matrix B , i.e., we have computed $-A_1^{-1} A_2$ and printed rows relating to the more important endogenous variables and columns relating to exogenous variables of interest. However, before we discuss the solution matrix, we will work through Table 2. It will be useful to consider some alternative selections of exogenous variables. Much of the flexibility of the ORANI

---

1. The exception is ΔB . The change in the balance of trade is a linear function of the percentage changes in the exogenous variables.

Table 2 : A Possible List of Exogenous Variables for MO 78

Variable	Subscript Range	Number	Description	Column no. in Table 1
$p^*_{(i2)}$	i=1,2	2	Foreign currency import prices	12, 13
t_i	i=1,2	2	One plus the ad valorem tariffs	42, 43
k_j	j=1,2	2	Current availability of capital stocks	45, 46
$f_{(31)}$		1	Wage shift variable	51
v_1 } $x_{(21)4}$ }		2	One plus the ad valorem export subsidy for the major export commodity and the export volume for the minor export commodity	40, 15
c_R		1	Real aggregate household expenditure	52
$f_{(i1)4}$	i=1,2	2	Shifts in export demands	16, 17
ϕ		1	The exchange rate, $A per $Foreign	39
	Total =	13		

model in policy applications arises from the user's ability to swap variables between the exogenous and endogenous categories.

The first group of exogenous variables given in Table 2 are the foreign currency prices of imports. MO 78 (in common with ORANI 78) contains no equations describing foreign supply conditions and therefore it is difficult to imagine a plausible experiment in which the $p^*_{(i2)}$ would be endogenous. By placing the $p^*_{(i2)}$, i=1,2, in the exogenous category, we are adopting the "small country" assumption for imports, i.e., world prices are independent of Australian demands. We are also allowing for the computation of answers to questions of the form : what were (or will be) the effects of past (or projected) changes in foreign import supply prices?

The second group of exogenous variables are the tariffs or tariff equivalents of quantitative restrictions. The tariffs are among the exogenous variables for any computation directed at the traditional effective protection question : which industries benefit and which lose from protection? Other questions might concern the effects of protection on employment and on the rate of inflation. Each of these questions could be analysed under exogenously given changes in the t_i . On the other hand, it would be possible to conduct MO 78 and ORANI 78 experiments in which some, or all, the t_i are endogenous. For example, we might wish to compute the level of protection which would be required to maintain current employment levels in footwear, say, in the face of exogenously given movements in foreign prices, domestic wages and the exchange rate. For such a computation, footwear employment would replace the footwear tariff in the exogenous list.

The third set of variables in Table 2 are the supplies or employment levels of industry capital stocks. With the k_j exogenous, our MO 78 solutions are short-run. That is, we are determining the effects of tariff changes, say, over a period sufficiently short such that induced changes in capital availability may be ignored. In the absence of a set of equations describing the costs of capital creation, there is no obvious alternative to the exogenizing of the k_j's .[1] In ORANI 78, where capital creation is modelled, we are able to determine rates of return, i.e., rental values of units of capital divided by the costs of creating new units. Then rates of return become the natural replacement for the k_j's on the exogenous list. When the rates of return, rather than the k_j's are exogenous, our solutions are long-run. For example, we might be investigating the long-run effects of a change in tariffs. Our assumption would be that in the long-run, rates of return are independent of tariff changes. Thus we would set rates of return exogenously. On the other hand, tariff changes will affect industry growth prospects. Thus we would allow the k_j's to be endogenous. In this way our model would capture the idea that initial disturbances in rates of return induced by the tariff change would be eliminated by changes across industries in their rates of capital accumulation.

The fourth variable on our illustrative exogenous list is $f_{(31)}$. If the parameter h in equation (2.54) is set at one

---

1. Nevertheless, in one short-run ORANI application the k_j's were swapped with the rentals, the $p_{(32)j}$'s in the notation of MO 78. The aim was to set an environment of fixed markup pricing. See Dixon, Parmenter and Powell [1978, Appendix] or Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, section 3.5].

(which it is in our present computations, see Table 1, row 38, column 51), then $f_{(31)}$ is the percentage change in real wages. If $f_{(31)}$ is set at zero, then MO 78 will determine the change in aggregate employment, ℓ, arising from changes in tariffs, etc., under conditions of maintenance of real wages and abundant supplies of labour. Alternatively, for a full employment simulation, ℓ would replace $f_{(31)}$ on the exogenous list, and MO 78 would generate the change in real wages which would be required for the achievement of full employment under the influence of proposed policy changes. In ORANI 78, where there are 9 occupational groups recognized, we can allow wages to adjust to cause full employment in some occupations, while allowing wages to be determined exogenously in others.

Our fifth group of typical exogenous variables are a selection of export subsidies and export levels. The export subsidy, v_1, for the major export commodity (see Figure 2) is set exogenously. On the other hand, for good 2, of which very little is exported, the export volume is exogenous while the export subsidy is endogenous. In ORANI 78, the user specifies a set G containing the labels of those commodities for which the model is to be allowed to explain exports. For all other commodities, i.e., $i \notin G$, exports are exogenous and the model produces the export subsidy (or tax) required to achieve the given export level. Certainly, the non-exported commodities, the services, construction, etc., always appear in the list given by $i \notin G$. Their exports, or more accurately, the percentage changes in them, are set exogenously at zero. The resulting endogenously determined subsidy rates are quite artificial, but also harmless. (For example, referring to MO 78, we see that if v_2 is endogenous, then it can simply be deleted from the model by deleting equation (2.37) for $i=2$.) In most ORANI computations, we have included in G those commodities for which exports are more than 20 per cent of total output. For these commodities, it is reasonable to assume that shifts in world prices, $p^*_{(i1)}$, strongly influence domestic prices, $p_{(i1)}$. Notice in equation (2.37) that if v_i is exogenous, then $p_{(i1)}$ will move with $p^*_{(i1)}$. By contrast if v_i is endogenous, then $p_{(i1)}$ will move independently of $p^*_{(i1)}$. Movements in $p^*_{(i1)}$ will be absorbed by offsetting movements in v_i.

The next variable on our exogenous list is c_R, the real aggregate level of household expenditure. By placing c_R on the exogenous list, we are setting an economic environment in which real aggregate demand is controllable independently of other variables appearing in Table 2. The underlying assumption is that policy makers have available macro instruments, not explained in MO 78, by which they can influence c_R. While MO 78 (in common with ORANI 78) cannot provide specific results concerning these macro instruments, it can provide some guidance. With c_R exogenous, MO 78 will indicate the change in the monetary aggregate, C, which would be required to achieve the exogenously specified change in C_R in view of whatever other exogenous changes have been introduced. For example, MO 78 will indicate that under an x per cent tariff cut, C should be changed by u per cent from what it otherwise would have been if we are to achieve the exogenously given target C_R. Alternatively, model users might set ΔB exogenously in place of c_R. In this case, MO 78 would indicate the change in real domestic absorption which would need to accompany a tariff cut, say, if we are to maintain a target level for the balance of trade.

The seventh group of variables in Table 2 are the shifts in foreign demand curves for local products, $f_{(i1)4}$, $i=1,2$. As was the case with the $p^*_{(i2)}$'s it is difficult to imaging a sensible experiment in which the $f_{(i1)4}$'s are endogenous. MO 78 and ORANI 78 have no equations relating the position of foreign demand curves to variables in the local economy. The role of the $f_{(i1)4}$'s is to allow model users to simulate the effects on the local economy of exogenously specified movements in export demand.

The last variable in Table 2 is the exchange rate, ϕ. It acts as the numeraire, i.e., it determines the absolute price level. With wages fully indexed and the exogenous variables as in Table 2, a one per cent increase in the exchange rate ($\phi = 1$) produces zero effect on all real endogenous variables and a one per cent increase in all domestic price and other nominal variables (see the column marked 39 in Table 3). Natural alternatives to ϕ as the numeraire include $p_{(31)}$, the wage rate,[1] and cpi, the consumer price index.

We conclude with one final comment on the partitioning of variables into the exogenous and endogenous categories. While our discussion of Table 2 indicates a wide variety of legitimate possibilities, it is not true that MO 78 (and ORANI 78) can be closed by the exogenous setting of <u>any</u> $n - m$ variables. For example, at least one monetary variable should be included in the exogenous list. If all domestic

---

1. This was the choice of Johansen [1960] and Taylor and Black [1974].

currency prices, the exchange rate, all wages and all monetary aggregates are treated as endogenous, then our computations will fail since there is nothing to determine the absolute price level. Similarly, some care is necessary to avoid inconsistencies. For example, if an attempt were made to set all three variables, c_R, c and cpi exogenously, then equation (2.55) would be violated. Although we can offer no formal theory to guide model users in their choice of exogenous variables, as a working rule, if a price appears on the exogenous list, then a corresponding quantity should be on the endogenous list and vice versa. If wages are exogenous, then employment will be endogenous; if subsidies are endogenous, then exports will be exogenous, etc..

4. SOME RESULTS FROM THE MO 78 MODEL

In Table 3 we have printed selected components from the 39 × 13 matrix, B , defined by (3.4). The table shows the elasticities[1] of 13 out of the 39 endogenous variables with respect to 4 of the 13 exogenous variables. With MO 78 it would be possible to print the entire B matrix. This would not be possible with ORANI 78 where both the numbers of equations (rows of B) and exogenous variables (columns of B) are many thousands. The ORANI 78 programmes are written so that users can not only choose which components of B to print, but they must also choose which components of B to compute. The selection of rows and columns of B for computation and examination will, of course, depend on the application.

For our illustrative application with MO 78 we will look at the implications of three broad approaches to macroeconomic policy : I. increased protection, II. reductions in real wages, and III. real demand expansion. Consequently, in Table 3 we have displayed the elasticities of selected endogenous variables with respect to (a) the rate of protection on the major import commodity, (b) the real wage rate and (c) the real level of household expenditure. Table 3 also gives some elasticities with respect to the exchange rate. These were included merely to confirm the role of ϕ as the numeraire under conditions of fixed real wages and the exogenous variable list as set out in Table 2.

---

1. Again we note the exception involving the balance of trade.

Table 3 : Selected Rows and Columns from an MO 78 Solution Matrix

Variable number	Endogenous variables \ Exogenous variables		39	43	51	52	Macro package
			ϕ exchange rate	t_2 tariff on good 2	$f_{(31)}$ real wage rate	c_R real aggregate absorption	2.76% increase in aggregate absorption plus 2.38% cut in real wages
18	z_1	output of industry 1	.0	-.44	-1.35	.15	3.62
19	z_2	output of industry 2	.0	.16	- .57	.85	3.71
20	$y_{(11)1}$	industry 1's commodity outputs	.0	-.47	-1.40	.13	3.69
21	$y_{(21)1}$		.0	-.39	-1.19	.19	3.35
22	$y_{(11)2}$	industry 2's commodity outputs	.0	.10	- .73	.80	3.94
23	$y_{(21)2}$		.0	.18	- .52	.86	3.61
28	ℓ_1	employment by industry	.0	-.66	-2.01	.22	5.39
34	ℓ_2		.0	.21	- .71	1.06	4.62
44	ℓ	aggregate employment	.0	-.23	-1.36	.64	5.01
47	m	aggregate imports	.0	-.15	.33	.96	1.86
48	e	aggregate exports	.0	-.36	-1.11	-.26	1.92
49	ΔB	balance of trade	.0	-.04	- .29	-.25	0.00
50	cpi	consumer price index	1.00	.52	1.07	.25	-1.86

4.1 Increased protection

There are several ORANI studies of the effects of protection. References were given in the introductory section. Much of what these studies imply is illustrated by the results in the t_2-column of Table 3.

The t_2-column refers to the effects of a one per cent increase in one plus the ad valorem tariff on commodity 2. From Figure 2 we see that the value of imports of good 2 on the domestic market is \$A17 whereas their foreign currency cost is \$A12, i.e.,

$$P_{(22)} M_2 = 5 + 2 + 10 = 17 ,$$

and

$$P^*_{(22)} \Phi M_2 = 12 ,$$

where M_2 is the volume of imports of good 2 and the remaining notation is as in section 2. Hence, it follows from equation (2.32) that

$$T_2 = 17/12 = 1.42 .$$

i.e., the ad valorem rate of protection on good 2 is 42 per cent. Thus, a one per cent increase in T_2 is a 1.42/.42 = 3.4 per cent increase in the ad valorem rate of protection. The entries in the t_2-column are, therefore, to be read as follows : if the ad valorem tariff on commodity 2 were increased by 3.4 per cent in an environment where tariff changes were not allowed to affect real aggregate demand, the real wage rate or any of the other variables in Table 2, then in the short-run we could expect output in industry 1 to be .44 per cent less than it would otherwise have been, output in industry 2 to be .16 per cent more than it otherwise would have been, etc.. By the short-run we mean a period which is sufficiently short such that we can ignore changes in capital availabilities that may be induced by the tariff change. On the other hand, enough time must be allowed for businessmen and consumers to adjust their input and output decisions to the new relative prices. In most ORANI applications papers we have assumed that such a time is about one to two years. On applying this rule to our MO 78 results, we would say that a sustained 3.4 per cent tariff increase on commodity 2 would, eighteen months later, cause the rate of output in industry 1 to be .44 per cent less than it otherwise would have been.

The main implications of the t_2-column accord well with those of numerous ORANI calculations. We see that MO 78 implies that tariffs are an ineffective instrument for stimulating aggregate employment. Our 3.4 per cent increase in the tariff on commodity 2 produces a .23 per cent reduction in total labour demand. The increase in employment in industry 2, whose production is heavily concentrated on commodity 2, is more than offset by the reduction in employment in industry 1. Protection of the import competing industry imposes cost increases on the rest of the economy. Notice that the tariff increase adds .52 per cent to the consumer price index. Under full wage indexation this adds .52 per cent to the per unit wage bills of all industries. Industry 1, which specializes in the production of the export commodity and thus faces a highly elastic demand curve, is poorly placed to pass on cost increases. The cost squeeze effect on export production is reflected by the .36 per cent reduction in the foreign currency value of exports. It is interesting that this reduction in exports is sufficiently large that the simulated net effect of the tariff increase on the balance of trade is a movement towards deficit.

Two results in the tariff column which may need further explanation are those for $y_{(21)1}$ and $y_{(11)2}$. Despite the increased protection for commodity 2, industry 1 cuts its production of commodity 2. Equally curious, at first sight, is industry 2's increase in production of commodity 1. The reason for these results can be understood if we think of industry production decisions in two stages. At the first stage, imagine that industry j produces commodities 1 and 2 in fixed proportions. Then j's reaction to the increased tariff on commodity 2 will depend on what happens to the industry's wage and material costs compared with what happens to the price of its output. The movement in the price of its output is a weighted average of the movements in the prices of commodities 1 and 2, where the weights reflect the shares of these commodities in the industry's total revenue. Under a tariff increase on commodity 2, there is a favourable movement in the product price for industry 2 (which specializes in the production of good 2) relative to industry 2's costs. On the other hand, there is an unfavourable movement in the product price to cost ratio in industry 1 (which specializes in the production of good 1). Thus on the assumption that the composition of each industry's output is fixed, it is now clear that the increase in T_2 would cause industry 1 to contract its output level (and its output of both commodities) while in industry 2 the output level would expand. This explains why z_1 is negative and z_2 is positive in the t_2-column of Table 3.

The second stage of the production decision concerns the product mix. Because the price of good 2 increases relative to that of good 1, both industries transform the composition of their output in favour of product 2. However, in the present computations, the transformation effects are small relative to the level-of-activity effects. The effect on industry 1's production of good 2 of the industry's reduction in its overall level-of-activity ($z_1 = -.44$) easily outweighs the transformation effect in favour of good 2. Similarly, the effect of industry 2's expansion in overall output on its production of good 1 outweighs the transformation effect against good 1.

4.2 Reductions in real wages

The $f_{(31)}$-column of Table 3 shows the effects on selected endogenous variables of a one per cent increase in the real wage rate. As with the tariff results, the MO 78 results for a real wage increase are an accurate guide to the corresponding results from ORANI. In several papers[1] ORANI has been used to identify increases in the costs of employing labour as the major factor in causing employment and balance of trade problems. Looking at the $f_{(31)}$-column of Table 3, we see that according to MO 78 a one per cent increase in real wages reduces aggregate labour demand by 1.36 per cent. The reduction is especially severe in industry 1 where employment falls by 2.01 per cent. This is explained by industry 1's specialization in the production of the export good, good 1. Because the price of good 1 is largely independent of domestic cost conditions, the output of good 1 is particularly adversely affected by cost increases.

1. For references, see introduction.

The poor performance in the production of good 1 is reflected in the movement of the balance of trade. The one per cent real wage increase produces a deterioration in the balance of trade which is equivalent to a loss of 1.45 per cent of export revenue (.29/20 = .0145). Most of this is explained by the reduction in exports. Nevertheless, there is also a significant increase in imports. Domestic cost increases reduce the competitiveness of the locally produced good 2, causing substitution towards the imported product. The increase in imports is limited, however, by the reduction in industry activity levels.

The reverse side of this unhappy picture is the effect of a reduction in the costs of employing labour. By multiplying the $f_{(31)}$-column by minus one, we obtain the effects of a one per cent wage cut. Thus, according to MO 78, reductions in real wages cause increases in demands for labour (especially in export oriented industries), an improvement in the balance of trade and a reduction in inflationary pressure. It is not surprising, therefore, that ORANI has been used to support the argument that reductions in real wages are the key to macroeconomic recovery. (See especially, Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, ch. 3].)

4.3 Real demand expansion

The c_R-column of Table 3 shows the effects of a one per cent expansion in real household expenditure. In MO 78, household demand is the only form of domestic absorption. Thus the results here should be compared with ORANI results for a general increase in real aggregate demand rather than with those for an expansion in household expenditure alone.

In a recent publication,[1] ORANI results were used to illustrate some of the difficulties of attempting to implement a macro policy based primarily on demand stimulation. The ORANI computations implied that although demand stimulation would generate increased employment opportunities, it would also involve increased inflationary pressure, problems on the balance of trade and an uneven response across industries. In the c_R-column of Table 3, we see that MO 78 implies that a one per cent increase in real aggregate demand will buy a .64 per cent increase in employment at the cost of an increase of .25 per cent in consumer prices and a deterioration in the balance of trade which is equivalent to the loss of 1.25 per cent of export revenue (-.25/20 = .0125). The corresponding tradeoff in the ORANI computations was a .58 per cent increase in employment for a 1.7 per cent increase in consumer prices and deterioration on the balance of trade worth 3.9 per cent of total exports. Thus, MO 78 gives a much more favourable picture of the tradeoff than does ORANI. Because MO 78 omits non-traded commodities, it exaggerates the extent to which the domestic price level is held in check by world prices. And because MO 78 exaggerates the ratio of trade to GNP, it underestimates the percentage impact on the trade accounts of the diversions in exports and the increases in imports required to service expansions in aggregate demand. Nevertheless, the MO 78 results illustrate the proposition that

---

1. Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, ch. 3].

"general demand stimulation cannot, by itself, provide a feasible approach for a return to full employment from a situation of (say) 5 per cent unemployment".[1]

What aspects of MO 78 (and ORANI) are responsible for these rather pessimistic results? Our theory implies that producers will respond to demand increases with an increase in output and employment only if the demand increase allows an improvement in their price/cost situation. With full wage indexation, prices and costs tend to move together. There is however, some limited opportunity for improvement in price/cost ratios. Recall that domestic products are modelled as imperfect substitutes for foreign ones. Therefore, increases in demand allow the prices of domestic goods to rise relative to those of foreign substitutes. Thus, because of the import component in both the consumer price index and in material input costs, the appropriate index of wages and materials costs shows a smaller increase than the index of prices of domestically produced commodities. This is the principal explanation of why MO 78 (and ORANI) produce a "Keynesian" employment response to an increase in aggregate demand under conditions of fixed real wages. It is also an important part of the explanation of the trade and industry results.

Price increases for domestic goods shift both foreign (export) and domestic demand away from local producers. Consequently, a major part of the increase in domestic absorption is provided by a deterioration in the balance of trade. Notice that the c_R-column shows both an

---

1. Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, section 3.2(b)].

increase in imports and a reduction in exports. The resulting movement towards deficit on the balance of trade accounts for about 40 per cent of the increase in absorption (.25/62 = .04). (The corresponding figure in ORANI computations is about 58 per cent.)

On examining the industry results, we again see the effects of a price/cost squeeze in the export sector. Industry 1 benefits from the demand increase to a much smaller extent than does industry 2. In ORANI computations many of the exporting industries are, in fact, shown with negative output and employment responses to general demand stimulation.[1] Thus, ORANI computations imply that general demand stimulation has uneven effects across the economy, benefiting those industries where cost increases are easily passed into higher prices while harming some export industries and industries facing intense import competition.

4.4 A macro package

Readers will have noticed from the last two subsections that wage cuts and demand stimulation give opposite industry effects. Wage cuts are particularly beneficial for export industries while demand stimulation is particularly beneficial for industries where international trade plays only a minor role. This suggests that a balanced stimulation of the economy might be obtained by a suitable combination of wage reduction and demand stimulation.

One way to investigate such a possibility would be to change the selection of exogenous variables from that shown in Table 2. We

---

1. See, for example, Table 3.2 in Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979].

could for example ask what would be the implications across industries of a reduction in real wages and an increase in aggregate demand which together were sufficient to cause a 5 per cent increase in aggregate employment without a deterioration on the balance of trade. Our two new exogenous variables would be ℓ set at +5 and ΔB set at zero. Our new endogenous variables would be $f_{(31)}$ and c_R, i.e., we would be determining the values of $f_{(31)}$ and c_R to be consistent with our exogenously given employment and balance of trade targets.

Rather than re-partitioning the A matrix and recomputing B (see (3.4)), we can adopt some short cuts. We note from Table 3 that if $f_{(31)}$ is α per cent and c_R is β per cent, then ℓ and ΔB will be given by

$$\ell = -1.36\alpha + .64\beta ,$$

and

$$\Delta B = - .29\alpha - .25\beta .$$

Hence, if $\ell = 5$ and $\Delta B = 0$, then α and β must be -2.38 and 2.76 respectively. That is, according to MO 78, a 5 per cent increase in aggregate employment demand without balance of trade difficulties is achievable by a 2.38 per cent reduction in real wages combined with a 2.76 per cent increase in real aggregate demand. (The corresponding results for ORANI are a 6.15 per cent reduction in real wages combined with a 3.21 per cent increase in real aggregate demand.[1])

In the final column of Table 3 we have shown industry output and other results for our MO 78 recovery package. The figures are

---

1. See Dixon, Powell and Parmenter [1979, ch. 3].

derived by multiplying the $f_{(31)}$-column by -.2.38 and the c_R-column by 2.76 and adding. The most interesting implication of the package (and one which is consistent with the ORANI computations) is that it generates a balanced stimulation of the economy. Similar output and and employment expansions are achieved in all industries.

5. THE LARGE CHANGE PROBLEM AND THE COMPUTATION OF ORANI SOLUTIONS

5.1 Non-linear methods

Since the publication in 1960 of Johansen's Multi-Sectoral Study of Economic Growth there has been intensive research on procedures for solving general equilibrium models. This has led to the development of several algorithms which do not resort to the linearizations adopted by Johansen. If we were to apply these algorithms to our MO 78 model, we could solve the 39 structural equations (2.7), (2.14), (2.19), (2.28), (2.30) - (2.32), (2.39), (2.41), (2.42) and (2.44) - (2.49) for the levels of the 39 endogenous variables. If we wanted to know the effects of a change in the exogenous variables we would compare the results from two solutions for our 39 equation non-linear system, each solution computed with alternative values for the exogenous variables. Thus we would avoid the disadvantage of the Johansen procedure, i.e., its inability to cope with "large" changes in the exogenous variables. Because in Johansen computations the coefficients in the A matrix (see equation (3.1)) are treated as parameters, the results are valid only for changes in the exogenous variables which are not sufficiently large to induce significant changes in the sales patterns of commodity outputs, the commodity compositions of industry outputs, the industrial compositions of factor employments, the input compositions of industry costs, etc..

Thus, the question arises as to why we retain the Johansen method in our computations for ORANI 78. Before we answer, however, it will be useful to give a brief overview of the modern alternatives.

Two approaches to solving general equilibrium models can be distinguished in the recent literature. The first exploits the fact that for many economic models the solution can be deduced from the solution of a suitably chosen constrained maximization problem and its dual. In the second approach, various equation solving methods are applied directly to the structural equations.[1]

We illustrate both approaches by considering the 2-household, v-commodity, pure exchange model defined as follows :

$$Z_1 = (C_1', C_2', P') ,$$

is a solution if and only if

(a) C_i maximizes $U_i(C_i)$ subject to $P'C_i = P'X_i$, for $i=1,2$, and

(b) $C_1 + C_2 = X_1 + X_2$.

P' is the $v \times 1$ vector of commodity prices, C_1 and C_2 are the $v \times 1$ consumption vectors for the two households, the U_i are their

---

1. The first approach has been applied within the IMPACT project to solve the SNAPSHOT model. (See Dixon, Harrower and Powell [1976], Dixon [1976b] and Dixon, Harrower and Vincent [1978]). Earlier applications appear in Takayama and Judge [1964, 1971], Goreaux and Manne [1973], Dixon [1975a, 1975b], Dixon and Butlin [1977] and Waelbroeck and Ginsburgh [1976]. For a recent theoretical survey with illustrative applications, see Manne, Chao and Wilson [1978]. The second approach has been adopted by, among others, Scarf [1973], Shoven and Whalley [1972, 1974a, 1974b] Whalley [1978], Adelman and Robinson [1978] and Dervis [1975, 1978].

utility functions[1] and the X_i are the $v \times 1$ vectors giving their initial commodity endowments. These latter variables are set exogenously, i.e.,

$$Z_2 = (X_1', X_2') \quad .$$

Condition (a) requires that each household maximizes its utility subject to its budget constraint while condition (b) requires that markets clear for commodities.

As an example of the first approach, we could solve this model by considering constrained maximization problems of the form

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \text{choose } C_1, C_2 \text{ to maximize} \\ \qquad w_1 U(C_1) + w_2 U(C_2) \ , \\ \text{subject to} \\ \qquad C_1 + C_2 = X_1 + X_2 \ , \end{array}\right\} \qquad (5.1)$$

where w_1 and w_2 are positive parameters normalized so that $w_1 + w_2 = 1$. The first order conditions for a solution of this problem can be written as

$$\nabla U_i(C_i) = \frac{1}{w_i} \Lambda, \qquad i=1,2 \ , \qquad (5.2)$$

and

$$C_1 + C_2 = X_1 + X_2 \ , \qquad (5.3)$$

where Λ is the $v \times 1$ vector of Lagrangian multipliers associated

---

1. We assume that the utility functions are strictly concave. This is a convenient assumption and is no more restrictive from an empirical point of view than the utility maximizing model itself (see Dixon [1975a], pp. 96-105). Strict concavity is required to ensure the validity of the w-iteration method to be discussed in the next paragraph (see Dixon [1975a], p. 6).

with the market clearing constraint. Now recall that necessary and sufficient conditions for satisfying part (a) of the requirements for a model solution are that there exist β_i such that the C_i, P and β_i jointly satisfy

$$\nabla U(C_i) = \beta_i P \ , \qquad i=1,2 \ ,$$

and

$$P' C_i = P' X_i \ , \qquad i=1,2 \ .$$

Thus, it is apparent that if we are fortunate enough that

$$\Lambda' C_i = \Lambda' X_i \ , \ \text{for} \ i=1,2 \ , \tag{5.4}$$

then the solution for the programming problem (5.1) has revealed a solution for our economic model with the price vector P being given by the vector of Lagrangian multipliers Λ . This suggests that we can compute equilibria for our economic model by solving a series of programming problems of the type (5.1), varying the w_i's until the fortunate set of circumstances (5.4) occurs. Intuitively, if in an initial calculation, we have[1]

$$\Lambda' C_1 > \Lambda' X_1 \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$\Lambda' C_2 < \Lambda' X_2 \ , \tag{5.6}$$

then we should decrease w_1 and increase w_2 . The expected effect is to reduce the consumption of household 1 and to increase the consumption of household 2, thus moving us closer to satisfying condition (5.4).

---

1. The market clearing constraint ensures that if $\Lambda' C_1 > \Lambda' X_1$, then $\Lambda' C_2 < \Lambda' X_2$.

As an example, of the second approach to the computation of economic equilibria, we could solve our pure exchange model via the excess demand functions. First we would derive the demand functions

$$C_i = C_i(P, P' X_i) \quad , \qquad i=1,2 \ , \tag{5.7}$$

implied by part (a) of the definition of an equilibrium. Then we would substitute (5.7) into the market clearing equations to obtain the v-equation system

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i(P, P' X_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{2} X_i = 0 \quad , \tag{5.8}$$

where the LHS of (5.8) is the vector of excess demands. We know that these excess demand functions are homogenous of degree zero in prices and thus one of the prices (say the last) can be set at 1.[1] In addition we can apply Walras' Law to eliminate one of the equations (say the last). Thus our problem reduces to solving the (v-1) equations

$$E(P^*) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.9}$$

where E and P* are, respectively, the vectors of excess demands and prices for the first (v-1) commodities. At this stage, a wide variety of solution techniques can be applied. Among these are the fixed-point procedures pioneered by Scarf [1973]. Of greater practical relevance, however, are the simple tâtonnement procedures, e.g., the Gauss-Seidel method. The Newton method and various other approaches which use information on the derivatives of the excess demand functions have also been found effective.

---

1. Alternatively, we can use a normalization rule of the form $\Sigma_i P_i = 1$.

5.2 The advantages of Johansen's linearization

In our work on the ORANI model we have found that the main advantage of the Johansen approach is its flexibility. By using the rectangular linear system (3.1) we gain flexibility in terms of (a) model size , (b) model modification,and (c) model application.

(a) Model size

The term 'model size' should be interpreted broadly. A model can be big either because it has a large number of equations or because its equations are highly non-linear. If we work with the system of linear equations (3.1), our model can remain small in terms of its computing requirements even though the numbers of equations may be several millions. Of course, in applying (3.3) to solve the model, some condensation may be required. But this is easily achieved by substituting out equations and variables. For example, if initially we have a 3 equation, 4 variable system of the form

$$Az = 0 \quad ,$$

then by using rules from high school algebra we can obtain a 2 equation 3 variable system of the form

$$A^*z^* = 0 \quad ,$$

where A^* is a 2×3 matrix and z^* is a 3×1 sub-vector of z .[1]

When we move to systems of non-linear equations, size can become a problem. This is despite the rapid advances of the last decade in non-linear methods for solving general equilibrium models. Under

---

1. The condensation process for ORANI is described in DPRS [1977], section 17. More detail is given by Sutton [1978].

the first approach discussed in section 5.1, care must be taken to limit the size of the constrained maximization problem to be solved at each step. Otherwise, even when convergence is very rapid (i.e., only a few solutions of the constrained maximization problem are required) computing costs can become prohibitive. Limiting the size of the constrained maximization problem without reducing the model's economic detail becomes very difficult, especially when it is recognized that non-linearities in the initial specification of the model must often be handled by piece-wise linear approximations involving large numbers of additional variables and constraints. Our own experience at the IMPACT project with the SNAPSHOT model (see footnote 1, p.60) has been that computing difficulties have constrained our specification of the model. For example, although estimates of the elasticities of substitution between imported and domestic goods of the same input-output classification are available and are used in ORANI (see references on p. 14), in SNAPSHOT we have been forced to reduce computing costs by treating the shares of imports in domestic markets as exogenous.

Recent results using the second approach to computing economic equilibria have looked more promising. Adelman and Robinson [1978, p. 11] comment that "we have not been constrained in our specification of the model by considerations of solution technique". They applied Gauss-Seidel methods to the excess demand functions for commodities and gradient methods to the excess demand functions for factors. Similarily, Whalley [1978] has been able to solve a large model of US, EEC and Japanese trade by applying both modified Scarf and Newton procedures to the excess demand functions. However, in

Whalley's case

> "restrictions of computational speed and size and storage facilities of machines are encountered by the present model." Whalley [1978, p. 2]

It is important to emphasize that the success of Adelman and Robinson and Whalley was not achieved via the blind application of standard equation-solving techniques. In both cases they relied on their intimate knowledge of the specific features of their models to improve computational efficiency. That is, their algorithms were tailor-made to their particular model. This reflects these researchers disenchantment with the performance of general purpose methods (such as Scarf's approach) when applied to models of the size and complexity required to support policy analysis. In the case of the ORANI model, there can be little doubt that the general purpose algorithms which are currently available would be inadequate if applied to the non-linear structural form. Whether or not a tailor-made algorithm could be devised is an open question. Our opinion is, however, that this would require either an impractically large input of time by a highly skilled team of programmers or a considerable simplification of the model's specification.

Because we have adopted the Johansen linearization, computing considerations have introduced no inflexibilities with regard to ORANI's size and specification. The degree of detail in the industry and commodity classifications and the degree of complexity in the myriad of substitution relationships is limited by data considerations long before computing becomes a constraint.

(b) Model modification

Since its first applications ORANI has undergone continuous modification. While most of these changes have been of a minor nature involving revisions in the input-output data base and in the estimates of various substitution elasticities, there have been some changes (e.g. the inclusion of multiproduct industries in the agricultural sector) which have required a complete respecification of large blocks of the structural equations.

From a computing point of view, the implementation of revisions in the ORANI model involves no special problems. Most revisions are handled by making the appropriate changes in the input-output and elasticities files and simply rerunning the programmes to form the A matrix. Where new variables or equations are required, the A matrix is expanded by the addition of new columns and rows. None of these procedures involves the rewriting of solution algorithms. The most that is called for is a change in the dimension statement of an inversion routine.

By contrast, in models relying on non-linear solution routines, computing considerations can play a major role in inhibiting revisions. As we saw in the last subsection, the success of non-linear approaches to solving large-scale general equilibrium models depends on the skillful adaptation of general purpose algorithms so that they take advantage of model specific features. Where a model is undergoing change, even in seemingly minor ways, the rethinking and rewriting of algorithms becomes an energy-sapping chore.

In the context of the ORANI model, the Industries Assistance Commission's aggregation/disaggregation facility[1] provides an interesting example of the advantage of flexibility in the area of model modification. The work of the Commission often involves inquiries into industries at a much finer classification than is given in the ORANI input-output accounts which are based on the 109-order ABS input-output tables (see references in section 1). For example, in the analysis of recent developments in the automobile industry, it is desirable to disaggregate the input-output category Motor Vehicles and Parts at least to the extent of distinguishing component manufacturing from assembling. What the Commission's aggregation/disaggregation programmes allow model users to do is to either combine or split[2] the rows and columns of the ORANI input-output accounts. Simultaneously, the programmes make the required adjustments in various dimension statements and reform the A matrix. Thus, when the Commission wishes to use the ORANI model with a revised industrial classification, the necessary model modifications are quite routine.

(c) Model application

In section 3 we discussed the advantages for policy applications of being able to switch variables between the exogenous and endogenous categories. This flexibility is greatly reduced in models where non-linear solution algorithms are adopted. In such models the

---

1. See Hagan, Wright and Smith [1979].

2. In the case of aggregation, the model user need supply no additional information. For disaggregation, the model user can supply information at varying levels of detail on how the relevant rows and columns should be split. The disaggregation programmes provide convenient default options where users have incomplete information on the input or sales structure of the sub-input-output industries.

replacement of one endogenous variable with another will, in general, constitute a major model revision and will require extensive rewriting of solution algorithms.

With the Johansen approach we can simply reallocate the columns of the A matrix between the A_1 and A_2 matrices (see equation (3.2)) and recompute the B matrix (see equations (3.3) and (3.4)). However, even this much computing may be unnecessary. For example, in section 4.4 we used a few hand calculations to move from a solution for MO 78 where the percentage changes in real wages $(f_{(31)})$ and aggregate real absorption (c_R) were exogenous to one in which these variables were replaced on the exogenous list by the change in the balance of trade (ΔB) and the percentage change in the level of employment (ℓ). It can be shown that the principal step required in the swapping of r variables between the endogenous and exogenous lists reduces to the inversion of an $r \times r$ matrix. Various other short-cuts are available for changing ORANI solutions where there are only a limited number of changes in the A matrix.[1] Thus, in practice, ORANI users store a few B matrices from standard runs. Then when new solutions are required, these can often be computed at trivial cost by modifying an earlier solution.

5.3 The elimination of the Johansen linearization errors

Given the advantages of working with the linear system (3.1), it is understandable that we have retained the Johansen approach in our

---

1. Sutton [1978], especially ch. 3, deals with the short-cut solution modification methods available in linear models.

work with the ORANI model. In fact, as was mentioned in subsection 5.2 (a), we doubt the practicality of applying non-linear methods to ORANI's structural form. An alternative approach, which seems to warrant detailed investigation, is to derive true ORANI solutions (i.e., solutions which are free from significant linearization error) by applying an n-step update procedure to the A matrix. This is being attempted for ORANI 78 as part of our current research. Some computations with MO 78 (to be reported below) give us confidence that the update procedure can be successfully applied to ORANI 78. If this turns out to be the case, then we will be able

(a) to give an indication of the likely size of the linearization errors involved in the use of the Johansen technique in typical ORANI applications, and

(b) to provide a means for eliminating these errors in applications where they are considered to be serious.

This will be achieved without a substantial loss in computing flexibility. The procedure we have in mind can be described as follows.

We start by rewriting equation (3.3) as

$$dY = B(Y, X)\, dX , \tag{5.10}$$

where the components of the vectors Y and X are the logarithms of the components of the vectors Z_1 and Z_2.[1] The B matrix is written as a function of Y and X to emphasize that its components could be expressed as functions of the logarithms of prices and quantities, i.e., as functions of Y and X. This follows from the

1. The balance of trade is an exception. It continues to appear in the "d" rather than the $d\,\ell n$ form.

fact that the B matrix is derived from the A matrix which is constructed from the input-output flows. Each input-output flow is a product of a price and a quantity and can be written as

$$\text{Flow} = \exp\left(\ln(\text{Price}) + \ln(\text{Quantity})\right) ,$$

i.e., each flow is a function of components of Y and X. Thus, A and hence B are functions of Y and X.

It should be noted that (5.10) involves no approximations. It is an exact implication of the structural equations. If we denote the exact solution to the structural equations by[1]

$$Y = F(X) , \tag{5.11}$$

then we have $$F'(X) = B(X, F(X)) ,$$

where $F'(X)$ is the Jacobian of F.

At this stage we recall that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\{ F'(X_o) + F'\left(X_o + \frac{h}{n}\right) + F'\left(X_o + \frac{2h}{n}\right) + \ldots . \; F'\left(X_o + \frac{(n-1)h}{n}\right) \right\} \frac{h}{n}$$
$$= F(X_o + h) - F(X_o) ,$$

provided only that the second derivatives of F remain bounded as we move from X_o to $X_o + h$. Thus, if we have a means of computing the F' matrix for all values of X, it is apparent that we can evaluate the change in Y caused by the movement of X from X_o to $X_o + h$ by computing the sum

$$(DY)_n = \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} F'\left(X_o + \frac{th}{n}\right) \frac{h}{n} , \tag{5.12}$$

---

1. Given X, we assume that the structural equations imply a unique solution for Y.

where n is chosen to be sufficiently large to ensure the desired degree of accuracy.

The application of these ideas to the problem of computing exact solutions for the ORANI model should be clear. Although we cannot solve the structural equations in the form (5.11), we do know how to evaluate F', at least for the initial situation, i.e., we know $B(X_o, Y_o)$. The obvious analogue to (5.12) is to calculate the change in Y caused by the movement in X from X_o to $X_o + h$ by computing

$$(DY)_n = \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} B\left(X_o + \frac{th}{n}, Y_t^n\right) \frac{h}{n}, \tag{5.13}$$

where

$$Y_o^n = Y_o, \tag{5.14}$$

and

$$Y_t^n = Y_{t-1}^n + B\left(X_o + \frac{(t-1)h}{n}, Y_{t-1}^n\right) \frac{h}{n}, \quad t=1,\ldots,n-1. \tag{5.15}$$

Equations (5.13) - (5.15) describe an n-step procedure. If we wish to compute the effects of changing the exogenous variables from X_o to $X_o + h$, then we divide the change into n parts. First, the effect of moving the exogenous variables from X_o to $X_o + h/n$ is computed as

$$(DY)_n^1 = B(X_o, Y_o) \frac{h}{n}.$$

Then the B matrix is re-evaluated at the point $\left(X_o + \frac{h}{n}, Y_o + (DY)_n^1\right)$. In practice, this re-evaluation would involve

(a) updating the input-output flows to take account of the changes in prices and quantities implied by the change in the exogenous variables from X_o to $X_o + \frac{h}{n}$,

(b) recomputing the A matrix using the updated flows, and

(c) recomputing the B matrix according to (3.4).

Having re-evaluated the B matrix, we compute the effect of moving the exogenous variables from $X_o + \frac{h}{n}$ to $X_o + \frac{2h}{n}$ by

$$(DY)_n^2 = B\left(X_o + \frac{h}{n}, Y_o + (DY)_n^1\right) \frac{h}{n} .$$

The B matrix is again re-evaluated, this time at the point $\left(X_o + \frac{2h}{n}, Y_o + (DY)_n^1 + (DY)_n^2\right)$. Then this latest value for B is used to compute the effects of changing the exogenous variables from $X_o + \frac{2h}{n}$ to $X_o + \frac{3h}{n}$, etc..

The first question regarding this n-step procedure is one of pure mathematics. Can we be sure that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} (DY)_n = F(X_o + h) - F(X_o) ,$$

where $(DY)_n$ is defined by (5.13) - (5.15)? The answer is yes, provided only that the first derivatives of B with respect to Y and the second derivatives of F with respect to X are bounded over the relevant domains in the (X, Y) space.[1] Because we fail

---

1. The relevant proposition is proved in Conte and de Boor [1972], pp. 332-335. For convenience of exposition, these authors confined themselves to the case where X and Y are scalars and F is a scalar function. Dixon [1979] presents the proposition in its full gruesome detail where X and Y are vectors and F is a vector function.

to generate exact values for Y as we move from X_o to $X_o + h$, we fail to generate exact values for $F'(X)$. However, we can still be sure that (5.13) will provide an accurate evaluation of the change in Y if n is sufficiently large.

The second question is one of practical computing. Can the n-step procedure be applied to ORANI 78? The ORANI input-output files identify about half a million flows. The updating of these flows and the recomputing of the A and B matrices will generate considerable computer costs. A complete ORANI solution working from the input-output tables through to the B matrix costs about \$A40 at the cheapest rates on the CSIRO's Cyber 76. We anticipate that another \$A20 will be required for each updating of the input-output flows. Thus, a single step of our n-step procedure may[1] cost about \$A60 at the prices existing in mid-1979. It is clear that unless n can be kept small, the procedure could be too expensive for routine use. Fortunately, however, it appears (on the basis of MO 78 computations) that for most purposes n can be very small. We expect that n = 2 will normally be more than adequate. In fact, we expect that the implementation of the procedure in ORANI 78 will provide a strong justification for the Johansen method (i.e., n = 1).

---

1. We expect that experience will suggest short-cut procedures for updating the A matrix and recomputing B . Thus, \$A60 is probably a generous upperbound on the eventual cost of each step of the n-step procedure.

The n-step update procedure applied to MO 78

As a preliminary step before attempting to implement our n-step update procedure in ORANI 78, we have applied it in MO 78. Some results are given in Tables 4 and 5.

In Table 4 we consider the effects of a 25 per cent increase in the tariff on good 2 under conditions of fixed real wages, fixed real aggregate demand and a fixed exchange rate -- the exogenous variables are those listed in Table 2. In the 1-iteration column, the computations were carried out by the usual Johansen method, i.e., we computed

$$z_1 = B z_2 ,$$

where B was derived from the initial A matrix (i.e., Table 1) and the components of z_2 were set at zero with the exception of t_2, which was set at 7.35. (Recall from section 4.1 that T_2 is one plus the ad valorem rate of protection and that the initial ad valorem rate is 42 per cent. To increase the ad valorem rate by 25 per cent, we increase T_2 by 7.35 per cent, i.e., we increase T_2 from 1.42 to 1.53). Thus, apart from rounding errors, the 1-iteration column of Table 4 can be obtained by multiplying the t_2-column of Table 3 by 7.35.

The n-iteration column of Table 4 was computed as follows. First we found x such that

$$(1.0735)^{1/n} = 1 + x .$$

Then we broke the increase in T_2 into n steps where the r^{th} step was concerned with the effects of increasing T_2 from $1.42\,(1.+ x)^{r-1}$ to $1.42(1 + x)^r$, i.e., we broke the increase in T_2 into n equal

Table 4 : The Implications for Selected Variables in MO 78 of a 25 per cent Increase in the Tariff on Good 2

Variable number	Variable name \ Number of iterations		1	2	4	8	16	32	64	Infinity[a]	2-iteration extrapolation[b]	Johansen error (per cent)[c]
18	z_1	output for industry 1	-3.2658	-3.1826	-3.1431	-3.1238	-3.1143	-3.1096	-3.1073	-3.1050	-3.0994	5.2
19	z_2	output for industry 2	1.2093	1.1817	1.1684	1.1618	1.1586	1.1570	1.1562	1.1554	1.1541	4.7
20	$y_{(11)1}$	industry 1's commodity outputs	-3.4110	-3.3232	-3.2815	-3.2612	-3.2512	-3.2462	-3.2437	-3.2412	-3.2354	5.2
21	$y_{(21)1}$	industry 1's commodity outputs	-2.8575	-2.7876	-2.7545	-2.7384	-2.7304	-2.7265	-2.7245	-2.7225	-2.7177	4.9
22	$y_{(11)2}$	industry 2's commodity outputs	0.7690	0.7466	0.7360	0.7307	0.7282	0.7269	0.7262	0.7255	0.7242	6.0
23	$y_{(21)2}$	industry 2's commodity outputs	1.3226	1.2934	1.2793	1.2724	1.2690	1.2673	1.2664	1.2655	1.2642	4.5
28	ℓ_1	employment by industry	-4.8987	-4.7549	-4.6868	-4.6536	-4.6373	-4.6291	-4.6251	-4.6211	-4.6111	6.0
34	ℓ_2	employment by industry	1.5117	1.4782	1.4620	1.4541	1.4502	1.4482	1.4473	1.4464	1.4447	4.5
44	ℓ	aggregate employment	-1.6935	-1.6384	-1.6124	-1.5997	-1.5935	-1.5904	-1.5889	-1.5874	-1.5833	6.7
47	m	aggregate imports	-1.1110	-1.0574	-1.0316	-1.0190	-1.0127	-1.0096	-1.0081	-1.0066	-1.0038	10.4
48	e	aggregate exports	-2.6773	-2.6231	-2.5972	-2.5845	-2.5782	-2.5751	-2.5735	-2.5719	-2.5689	4.1
49	ΔB	balance of trade	-0.3021	-0.3025	-0.3027	-0.3029	-0.3029	-0.3030	-0.3030	-0.3030	-0.3028	0.3
50	cpi	consumer price index	3.8077	3.7868	3.7767	3.7718	3.7694	3.7682	3.7676	3.7670	3.7659	1.1

(a) Computed by adding the change in the result as we go from 32 to 64 iterations to the result after 64 iterations.

(b) Computed by adding the change in the result as we go from 1 to 2 iterations to the result after 2 iterations.

(c) Computed by comparing the 1-iteration result with the result in the infinity column.

increases in its logarithm. The effects of the first increase in T_2, i.e. the increase from 1.42 to 1.42(1 + x), were computed using the initial B matrix. Then the input-output flows were updated according to the formula

$$(\text{Flow})_2 = (\text{Flow})_1 \left(1 + \frac{p(1)}{100}\right) \left(1 + \frac{q(1)}{100}\right) ,$$

where $(\text{Flow})_1$ is the initial value in the input-output tables and $(\text{Flow})_2$ is the value appearing after the first update. p(1) and q(1) are the percentage changes in the relevant price and quantity variables generated in the first step, i.e., as a result of increasing T_2 from 1.42 to 1.42(1 + x). Both p(1) and q(1) may, of course, be either endogenous or exogenous. On completing the first update of the input-output flows, we recomputed the A and B matrices and used the new B matrix to compute the effects of moving T_2 from 1.42(1 + x) to $1.42(1 + x)^2$. The input-output flows were again updated, etc.. The final results in the n-iteration column of Table 4 are of the form

$$\frac{\text{Result}}{100} = \left(1 + \frac{v(1)}{100}\right) \left(1 + \frac{v(2)}{100}\right) \cdots\cdots \left(1 + \frac{v(n)}{100}\right) - 1 ,$$

where v(r) is percentage change in the variable arising at the r^{th} step.

A glance at Table 4 reveals that the results in every row conform very closely to the rule

$$R(2m) - R(m) = 2(R(4m) - R(2m)) , \tag{5.16}$$

where R(s) is the result from the s-iteration computation and m is any non-negative integer power of 2. For example, when we look at the results for variable 18, we see that

$$R(16) - R(8) = -3.1143 + 3.1238 = 0.0095 ,$$

and

$$R(8) - R(4) = -3.1238 + 3.1431 = 0.0193 ,$$

i.e., $R(8) - R(4) \doteq 2[R(16) - R(8)]$.

This suggests an easy way to compute

$$R(\infty) = \lim_{q\to\infty} \left\{ R(2^q) \middle| q = \text{positive integer} \right\} ,$$

where $R(\infty)$ is the MO 78 result without linearization error, i.e., the result implied by the structural form. We simply note that (5.16) implies that[1]

$$R(\infty) = R(2m) + (R(2m) - R(m)) . \tag{5.17}$$

In the "infinity" column we have applied (5.17) with $m = 32$. For example, in row 18 we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(\infty) &= R(64) + (R(64) - R(32)) \\ &= -3.1073 + 0.0023 \\ &= -3.1050 . \end{aligned}$$

There can be no doubt that these calculations provide highly accurate estimates of the true MO 78 results. We will in fact accept them as being free from linearization error. This leaves us

---

1. From (5.16) we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(2m) - R(m) &= 2(R(4m) - R(2m)) \\ R(4m) - R(2m) &= 2(R(8m) - R(4m)) \\ &\vdots \\ \hline R(\infty) - R(m) &= 2(R(\infty) - R(2m)) \end{aligned}$$

On rearranging, we obtain (5.17). The existence of $R(\infty)$ is ensured by the assumption that the structural equations have a unique solution.

in a position to answer two important questions. How close were we to the true results after a 1-iteration calculation? How close could we get by applying (5.17) with $m = 1$?

In the final column of Table 4 we have expressed the absolute differences between the $R(\infty)$'s and the $R(1)$'s as percentages of the absolute values of the $R(\infty)$'s . The results are certainly encouraging for users of the Johansen method. The linearization errors generated in the particular experiment under consideration average about 5 per cent, with the largest being 10 per cent. Even the 10 per cent error could hardly be of any practical concern. It would be a brave model user who would express a strong preference between -1.0066 per cent and -1.1110 per cent as alternative projections of the effect on aggregate imports of a 25 per cent increase in a particular tariff. Nevertheless, if there were a need to eliminate linearization errors, it appears that this could be achieved with only a single update of the input-output flows and a single recomputation of the A and B matrices. The column marked "2-iteration extrapolation" was generated by applying (5.17) with $m = 1$. The results are almost indistinguishable from those in the infinity-column.

Cautious readers will be wondering whether there is any basis for expecting these very encouraging results to be applicable outside MO 78 or for experiments apart from a 25 per cent increase in the tariff on good 2. We have run many different experiments with MO 78 including a complete removal of the tariff on good 2. In all the cases examined so far we have found that rule (5.16) is an excellent approximation and that linearization errors are almost completely eliminated by extrapolation from the results for the 1 and 2 iteration computations. For example, in Table 5 we have redone the macro package (last column of Table 3) using various numbers of iterations.[1] For these calculations the list of exogenous variables given in Table 2 was modified by the addition of ℓ and ΔB and the deletion of $f_{(31)}$ and c_R. (The short-cut method described in section 4.4 is no longer applicable.) Labour demand was increased by 5 per cent using 1, 2, 4, etc., steps. The table implies that there were only very small linearization errors associated with our initial computation of the macro package and that these become barely detectable when we apply (5.17) with $m = 1$.

Much of our optimism about the eventual outcome of our current work on implementing the n-stage update procedure in ORANI 78 arises from rule (5.16). Our guess is that this rule is telling us that the solution equations (5.11) for MO 78 can be closely approximated over the policy-relevant domain of X by the quadratic equations

$$Y_i = U_i + V_i X + \tfrac{1}{2} X' W_i X \quad , \qquad i=1,\ldots,39 \quad , \qquad (5.18)^2$$

where Y_i is the logarithm of the i^{th} endogenous variable and U_i, V_i and W_i are, respectively, 1×1, 1×13 and 13×13 matrices

---

1. The small differences between the results in the macro package column of Table 3 and those in the 1-iteration column of Table 5 are caused by rounding. The computations in Table 3 were made with the A matrix as in Table 1, i.e., with each coefficient correct to 2 decimal places. By the time Table 5 was generated, the process of computing A from the input-output flows had been computerized and a higher level of accuracy was achieved.

2. Recall that MO 78 has 52 variables and 39 equations.

Table 5 : The Implications for Selected Variables in MO 78 of a 5 per cent Increase in Labour Demand Without a Deterioration in the Balance of Trade

Variable number	Variable name \ Number of iterations	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	Infinity[a]	2-iteration extrapolation[b]	Johansen error (per cent)[c]
18	z_1 output for industry 1	3.5870	3.5765	3.5714	3.5689	3.5676	3.5670	3.5667	3.5664	3.5660	0.6
19	z_2 output for industry 2	3.6956	3.6805	3.6731	3.6694	3.6675	3.6656	3.6662	3.6658	3.6654	0.8
20	$y_{(11)1}$ industry 1's commodity outputs	3.6787	3.6679	3.6626	3.6600	3.6587	3.6581	3.6578	3.6575	3.6571	0.6
21	$y_{(21)1}$ industry 1's commodity outputs	3.3292	3.3192	3.3145	3.3122	3.3110	3.3105	3.3102	3.3099	3.3092	0.6
22	$y_{(11)2}$ industry 2's commodity outputs	3.9736	3.9581	3.9505	3.9466	3.9447	3.9438	3.9433	3.9428	3.9426	0.8
23	$y_{(21)2}$ industry 2's commodity outputs	3.6241	3.6090	3.6016	3.5980	3.5962	3.5952	3.5948	3.5944	3.5939	0.8
28	ℓ_1 employment by industry	5.3805	5.3888	5.3929	5.3950	5.3960	5.3965	5.3968	5.3971	5.3971	0.3
34	ℓ_2 employment by industry	4.6195	4.6112	4.6071	4.6050	4.6040	4.6035	4.6032	4.6029	4.6029	0.4
47	m aggregate imports	1.8364	1.8229	1.8163	1.8131	1.8115	1.8107	1.8103	1.8100	1.8094	1.5
48	e aggregate exports	1.9282	1.9142	1.9073	1.9038	1.9021	1.9012	1.9008	1.9004	1.9002	1.4
50	cpi consumer price index	-1.8612	-1.8286	-1.8127	-1.8049	-1.8010	-1.7990	-1.7980	-1.7970	-1.7960	3.6
51	$f_{(31)}$ real wage rate	-2.3795	-2.3397	-2.3200	-2.3102	-2.3053	-2.3028	-2.3016	-2.3004	-2.2999	3.4
52	c_R real aggregate absorption	2.7564	2.7385	2.7299	2.7256	2.7235	2.7224	2.7219	2.7214	2.7206	1.3

(a) Computed by adding the change in the result as we go from 32 to 64 iterations to the result after 64 iterations.

(b) Computed by adding the change in the result as we go from 1 to 2 iterations to the result after 2 iterations.

(c) Computed by comparing the 1-iteration result with the result in the infinity column.

of coefficients. This conjecture is based on the fact that if we applied (5.12) to (5.18), we would obtain[1]

$$(DY_i)_n = \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \left[V_i + (X_o + \frac{t}{n} h)' W_i\right] \frac{h}{n} , \tag{5.19}$$

i.e., $$(DY_i)_n = V_i h + X_o' W_i h + \frac{n-1}{2n} h' W_i h ,$$

which would imply that

$$(DY_i)_{2n} - (DY_i)_n = 2\left[(DY_i)_{4n} - (DY_i)_{2n}\right] . \tag{5.20}$$

(5.20) means that if (5.18) were precisely valid and we were making precise evaluations of the Jacobian as we move X from X_o to $X_o + h$, then (5.16) would hold exactly. If on the other hand (5.18) were merely a good approximation and/or we were only approximating the Jacobian as we moved X, then we would expect (5.16) to be only approximately valid. This has been the case with our MO 78 computations. Thus our computations are consistent with (although not definitive evidence for) the hypothesis that MO 78 solution equations are very closely approximated by the quadratic form (5.18) in the relevant domain of X.

The equations which make up the structural form of ORANI 78 involve non-linearities of the same general nature as those encountered in the structural equations of MO 78. Since there is strong evidence to suggest that the solution equations for MO 78 are approximately quadratic, it is reasonable to suppose that the solution equations for ORANI 78 are approximately quadratic. Hence, it is reasonable to suppose that

1. We assume, without loss of generality, that W_i is symmetric.

rule (5.16) will apply and that the elimination of linearization errors from ORANI computations will be achievable with very small numbers of recomputations of the A and B matrices.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Our primary objective in presenting MO 78 has been to give readers rapid access to the key ideas and techniques (see (a) - (f) on page 4) underlying ORANI 78. MO 78 has also been helpful from the point of view of our own research. For example, in section 5 we used MO 78 as a guinea-pig for testing the performance of a particular computing strategy.

In conclusion, it may be useful to comment on two issues on which little has been said : validation and lagged adjustment responses. In comparison to builders of macro models, researchers working in the Johansen tradition have given these issues a relatively light weight. The obvious reason for this is the scarcity of time series data at a suitable level of disaggregation.

Nevertheless, if sufficient research resources were available, some partial validation exercises of the type conducted for the SNAPSHOT model by Dixon, Harrower and Vincent [1978] could be attempted for ORANI 78. For that exercise we adopted 1962-63 as a base year. Then we showed that SNAPSHOT projected an accurate picture of the 1971-72 economy if it were supplied with an accurate description of the technological, demographic and trading conditions of 1971-72. With regard to lagged adjustment responses, FitzGerald [1979] has provided a theoretical paper showing how these could be handled within the ORANI model. The question of whether sufficiently dissagregated time-series data is availabe for a worthwhile implementation of FitzGerald's ideas is currently under investigation.

Despite vagueness concerning the timing of responses[1] and the lack of formal validation, there has been increasing interest by economists and policy makers in tightly constrained disaggregated models where data deficiencies are covered by strong assumptions from microeconomic theory. The economic disturbances of the early seventies -- for example, the changes in the international monetary system, the sudden escalation in energy prices and the dramatic increase in real wages -- left many econometric models floundering. They were unable to provide useful simulations of the effects of the shocks or to give guidance on the appropriate policy responses. It became apparent that while many models can fit available time series data, it is only by close attention to theory that one can hope to create models capable of giving insights into the implications of disturbances which carry the economy away from previously established historic trends.

A second factor in explaining the interest in models such as ORANI is the increase in demands by governments for detailed projections, in an economy-wide setting, of the effects of proposed policy changes. Besides the traditional macro aggregates, governments have become concerned with individual industries, regions and occupational groups. In the case of the Australian Government, for example, traditional macro models are insufficient to support the

---

1. Recall from section 3 that ORANI can be run in either short-run mode (exogenous capital stocks, endogenous rates of return) or long-run mode (endogenous capital stocks, exogenous rates of return). The short-run mode has been preferred for projections of the effects of policy changes after 1 to 2 years. For projections of the effects after 5 or more years, the long-run mode is applicable.

work of agencies such as the Industries Assistance Commission, the Department of Industry and Commerce, the Department of Trade and Resources, the Department of Productivity, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs, the Bureau of Transport Economics and the Department of National Development.

REFERENCES

Adelman, I. and S. Robinson, Income Distribution Policy in Developing Countries : A Case Study of Korea, Oxford University Press, 1978, pp. xvii + 346.

Alaouze, Chris M., "Estimation of the Elasticity of Substitution Between Imported and Domestically Produced Intermediate Inputs", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. OP-07, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, September 1976, pp. 32.

Alaouze, Chris M., "Estimates of the Elasticity of Substitution Between Imported and Domestically Produced Goods Classified at the Input-Output Level of Aggregation", IMPACT Working Paper No. O-13, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, October 1977a, pp. 33.

Alaouze, Chris M., "A Disaggregated Measure of Pressure of Demand : its Use in Import Demand Estimation", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. OP-16, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, October 1977b, pp. 40.

Alaouze, Chris M., J.S. Marsden and John Zeitsch, "Estimates of the Elasticity of Substitution Between Imported and Domestically Produced Commodities at the Four Digit ASIC Level", IMPACT Working Paper No. O-11, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, July 1977, pp. 66.

Armington, Paul S., "The Geographic Pattern of Trade and the Effects of Price Changes", IMF Staff Papers, Vol. XVI, July 1969.

Armington, Paul S., "Adjustment of Trade Balances : Some Experiments with a Model of Trade Among Many Countries", IMF Staff Papers, Vol. XVII, November 1970.

Artus, J.R. and R.R. Rhomberg, "A Multilateral Exchange Rate Model", IMF Staff Papers, Vol. XX, November 1973.

Australian Bureau of Statistics, Australian National Accounts -- Input-Output Tables 1968/69, Canberra, 1977.

Conte, S.D. and C. de Boor, Elementary Numerical Analysis, Second Edition (New York : McGraw-Hill, 1972), pp. x + 396.

Dervis, Kemal, "Planning Capital-Labor Substitution and Intertemporal Equilibrium with a Non-Linear Multisector Growth Model", European Economic Review, Vol. 6, 1975, pp. 77-96.

Dervis, Kemal, "Analysing the Resource Pull Effect of a Devaluation Under Exchange Control", International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington D.C., 1978. (Forthcoming in Journal of Development Economics.)

Dixon, P.B., The Theory of Joint Maximization (Amsterdam : North-Holland), 1975a.

Dixon, P.B., "The Computation of Economic Equilibria : A Joint Maximization Approach", Paper presented to the Third World Congress of the Econometrics Society, Toronto, 1975b. (Forthcoming in Metroeconomica.)

Dixon, P.B., "Effective Exchange Rates and the International Monetary Fund's Multilateral Exchange Rate Model : A Review", Australian Economic Papers, Vol. 15, No. 26, June 1976, pp. 59-75.

Dixon, P.B., "A Jointmax Algorithm for the Solution of SNAPSHOT", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. SP-03, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, April 1976b, pp. 44.

Dixon, P.B., "Simulation of Large Changes with the ORANI Model : Some Preliminary Mathematics", Research Memorandum, IMPACT Project, Melbourne, January 1979 (mimeo), pp. 16.

Dixon, P.B. and M.W. Butlin, "Notes on the Evans' Model of Protection", Economic Record, Vol. 53 (143), September 1977, pp. 337-349.

Dixon, P.B., J.D. Harrower and A.A. Powell, "SNAPSHOT, a Long Term Economy-Wide Model of Australia : Preliminary Outline", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. SP-01, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, February 1976, pp. 26.

Dixon, P.B., J.D. Harrower and A.A. Powell, "Long Term Structural Pressures on Industries and the Labour Market", Australian Bulletin of Labour, Vol. 3, No. 3, June 1977, pp. 5-44.

Dixon, P.B., J.D. Harrower and D.P. Vincent, "Validation of the SNAPSHOT Model", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. SP-12, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, July 1978, pp. 65.

Dixon, P.B., B.R. Parmenter, G.J. Ryland and J.M. Sutton (DPRS), ORANI, A General Equilibrium Model of the Australian Economy : Current Specification and Illustrations of Use for Policy Analysis, First Progress Report of the IMPACT Project, Vol. 2 (Canberra : Australian Government Publishing Service, July 1977), pp. xi + 297.

Dixon, P.B., B.R. Parmenter and J.M. Sutton, "Industry Implications of International Trade Policy : Experiments with the ORANI Model", Paper presented to the 48th ANZAAS Congress, Melbourne, 1977, pp. 31.

Dixon, P.B., B.R. Parmenter and J.M. Sutton, "Spatial Disaggregation of ORANI Results : A Regional Balance Method", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. OP-19, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, February 1978a, pp. 64. (Forthcoming in Economic Analysis and Policy.)

Dixon, P.B., B.R. Parmenter and J.M. Sutton, "Some Causes of Structural Maladjustment in the Australian Economy", Paper presented to the Winter School, Economic Society of Australia and New Zealand, NSW Branch. Also in Economic Papers, No. 57, January 1978b, pp. 10-26.

Dixon, P.B., B.R. Parmenter and A.A. Powell, "Structural Adjustment and the Macroeconomy", Paper presented at the Conference on the Economics of Structural Change and Adjustment, University of Newcastle, November 1978, pp. 48.

Dixon, P.B., B.R. Parmenter, A.A. Powell and D.P. Vincent, "The Agricultural Sector in ORANI 78", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. OP-25, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, June 1979, pp. 78.

Dixon, P.B. and A.A. Powell, with a contribution by B.R. Parmenter, Structural Adaptation in an Ailing Macroeconomy (Melbourne : Melbourne University Press, 1979), pp. xvii + 88.

FitzGerald, V., "A Variant of the ORANI Model for the Analysis of Short-Period Responses", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. OP-23, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, April 1979, pp. 61.

Freebairn, J.W., "Projections of Australia's World Trade Opportunities : Mid and Late Nineteen Eighties", IMPACT Working Paper No. I-07, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, December 1978, pp. 88.

Goreaux, L. and A. Manne (editors), Multi-level Planning : Case Studies in Mexico (Amsterdam : North-Holland), 1973.

Hagan, P., J.S. Wright and D. Smith, "Incorporating an Aggregation/Disaggregation Facility into the ORANI Model", Industries Assistance Commission, Canberra, May 1979 (draft).

Industries Assistance Commission, Structural Change and Economic Interdependence (Canberra : Australian Government Publishing Service, 1977), pp. x + 46.

Johansen, L., A Multisectoral Study of Economic Growth (Amsterdam : North-Holland, 1960), 2nd edition 1974.

Klijn, Nico, "Revaluation and Changes in Tariff Protection - The Short Term Effects with Special Reference to Agriculture", Paper presented at the Australian Agricultural Economics Society, 18th Annual Conference, Perth, February 1974.

Manne, A.S., Hung-po Chao and R. Wilson, "Computation of Competitive Equilibria by a Sequence of Linear Programs", Department of Operations Research, Stanford University, March 1978.

Marsden, J.S. and L.F. Milkovits, "The Construction of Price and Quantity Indexes for Australian Trade Flows", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. IP-03, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, October 1977, pp. 76.

Powell, A.A., The IMPACT Project : An Overview -- First Progress Report of the IMPACT Project, Vol. 1 (Canberra : Australian Government Publishing Service, March 1977), pp. xix + 182.

Powell, A.A. and B.R. Parmenter, "The IMPACT Project as a Tool for Policy Analysis : Brief Overview", The Australian Quarterly, Vol. 51 (1), March 1979, pp. 62-74.

Scarf, H., The Computation of Economic Equilibria, Yale University Press, New Haven and London (1973).

Shoven, J.B. and J. Whalley, "A General Equilibrium Calculation of the Differential Taxation of Income from Capital in the U.S.", Journal of Public Economics, 1, No. 3 (1972).

Shoven, J.B. and J. Whalley, "General Equilibrium with Taxes : A Computational Procedure and an Existence Proof", Review of Economic Studies, 40 (1974a), pp. 475-489.

Shoven, J.B. and J. Whalley, "On the Computation of Competitive Equilibrium on International Markets with Tariffs", Journal of International Economics, 4 (1974b), pp. 341-354.

Staelin, C.P., "A General Equilibrium Model of Tariffs in a Non-Competitive Economy", Journal of International Economics, 6, 1976, pp. 39-63.

Sutton, J.M., Solution Techniques for the ORANI Model of the Australian Economy, thesis accepted for the degree of Master of Engineering Science (Operations Research) at the University of New South Wales, March 1978.

Takayama, T. and G.C. Judge, "Equilibrium among Spatially Separated Markets : A Reformation", Econometrica, Vol. 32, 1964, pp. 510-24.

Takayama, T. and G.C. Judge (editors), Spatial and Temporal Price and Allocation Models (Amsterdam : North-Holland), 1971.

Taylor, L. and S.L. Black, "Practical General Equilibrium Estimation of Resource Pulls under Trade Liberalization", Journal of International Economics, Vol. 4 (1), April 1974, pp. 35-58.

Printed by C. J. THOMPSON, Commonwealth Government Printer, Canberra

Tulpulé, A. and A.A. Powell, "Estimates of Household Demand Elasticities for the ORANI Model", IMPACT Preliminary Working Paper No. OP-22, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, September 1978, pp. 46.

Vincent, D.P., P.B. Dixon and A.A. Powell, "The Estimation of Supply Response in Australian Agriculture : The CRESH/CRETH Production System", IMPACT General Paper No. G-12, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, May 1978, pp. 33. (Forthcoming in International Economic Review.)

Vincent, D.P., P.B. Dixon, B.R. Parmenter and D.C. Sams, "The Short Term Effect of Oil Price Increases on the Australian Economy with Special Reference to the Agricultural Sector", IMPACT General Paper No. G-17, Industries Assistance Commission, Melbourne, February 1979, pp. 50. (Forthcoming in Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics.)

Waelbroeck, J. and V. Ginsburg, "Computational Experience with a Large General Equilibrium Model", in J. Los and M. Los (editors), Computing Equilibria : How and Why (Amsterdam : North-Holland), 1976.

Whalley, John, "General Equilibrium Analysis of US-EEC-Japanese Trade and Trade Distorting Policies : A Model and Some Initial Findings", University of Western Ontario, 1978.