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## EFFECTS OF MACROECONOMIC POLICIES <br> ON RURAL NONFARM ENTERPRISES


#### Abstract

The study is generally aimed at analyzing the effects of macroeconomic policies on rural nonfarm enterprises (RNEs) by constructing a RNE submodel and linking it with the PIDS NEDA maoroeconometric model for the Philippine economy. The submodel consists of three blocks each consisting of 12 seemingly unrelated equations describing the relationship of demand, employment, and prices with various explanatory variablee. RNEe were defined as manufacturing industries located outside Metro Manila and were divided.into 12 sectore. The trend in the dietribution of nonfarm enterprises between Metro Manila and the rural areas and the growth in number of establishments, output, and employment in RNE were examined.


In general, the empirical results conform with theoretical expectations. As hypothesized, price coefficients in the demand equations are negative while those of consumption expendituree are poeitive. The estimates of the employment equations show that the coefficients of output are positive and generaly statistically significant. The wage rate has a negative coefficient while capital inveetment or intereat rate has a positive relationship with employment.

To determine the tracking ability of the model; a fully dynamic simulation was undertaken for the period 1981 to 1989. To validate the model, the root mean square percentage errore were computed. Except for the GVA from tobacco manufacture, the RSMPE statistics ie less than 25 percent. The GVA for food, textile, petroleum and others has a EMSPE of less than 10 percent while that for aggregate GVA for all RNEs is 5.27 percent.

For employment. ten out of the 12 RNE eectore have RMSPE statietice of lees than 20 percent. The aggregate employment equation (identity) performed quite well with a RMSPE of lees than 10 percent. The performance of the price equations appears to be much better than the output and employment equations with 11 sectors having RSMPE etatiatice of less than 10 percent and five out 12 eectore with leee than 5.0 percent.

By linking the RNE submodel with the PIDS NEDA macroeconometric model, the effects of three major policiee on RNEs were estimated. Theae are changee in wage rate, exchange rate, and merchandise exports. In general, increase in the wage rate results in a decilne in employment, an increase in prices, and consequently a drop in output. The immediate effect of an increase in the exchange rate is to increase domestic prices which would lower the demand for goods and reduce employment. The empirical resulte of the simulation exercise for the period 1981 to 1989 generally conform with these expectations. The impact of higher manufactured exporte consiets of higher output and employment in the RNEs.

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Significance of the etudy

A major component of the Philippine development plan is rural-based employment-oriented development strategy as a means of alleviating poverty in the countryside. To industrialize the rural areas and to eustain efforts to increase rural incomes has to come not only from agriculture but as a total development strategy. Here, the promotion of nonfarm enterprises is crucial in absorbing labor, increasing value added from agriculture, and income: Yet, in the past, macroeconomic policies such as high tariff rates, import controls, overvalued exchange rate, etc. have been biased against mall scale enterpriaes. in the rural areas.

Predominantly agricultural, agriculture nas been a major. source of growth in the Philippines. However, agricultural growth is not sufficient. Rural based industrialization is a oritical determinant of the long run development prospects of the country. Small firms have persisted in large numbers at all phases of the economic history of market economies. Whether in developed or less developed countries, small enterprises play a eignificant role in all stages of economic development (NORDIC, 1989). Moreover, the emergence of the educated unemployed, the increase in unemployment in urban areas, and the structural imbalance between rural and urban areas are leading to a new interest in rural nonfarm activities (CIDA, 1989).

In the Philippines where excess labor existe, where rural-urban migration heightens poverty in the urban areas, the develorment of nonfarm enterprises which will absorb labor and provide greater income is quite imperative. Policy reforms have been pursued, hence, it is important that the effects of macroeconomic policies on rurel nonfarm enterprises (RNE) be studied.

In 1989, there were an estimated 77,805 manufacturing establishments in the Philippines, 80 percent of them located in the rural areas or outside Metro Manila: They employ more than 1.2 million peopple about one-half of which are in the rural areas. These nonfarm enterprises,
particularly the mall and medium industries, are well dispersed geographically and most of them have to deal with poor infrastructure and inadequate access to support services. Analyzing the credit delivery to rural enterprises, Llanto, et. al. (1988) argued that the lack of credit for rural enterprises in the Philippines is not necessarily symptomatic of capital market distortion which penalized small enterprises. Rather it could be interpreted as a "filter that eliminates the dishonest, the incompetent" (Little, 1987) and the nonviable loan applicante. The problem is probably not lack of formal credit per se but lack of readiness or maturity of rural enterprises, especially the emall ones, for formal credit. The implication is that the barriers to the access to formal credit must be overcome. Extemally, barriers not only to credit but also to other incentives consist of financial and economic policies at the macro level which deternine the operation, growth and efficiency of theee enterprises. Policies that provide ample access to infrastructure, markets, basic economic services, and other resources would strengthen the competitiveness of rural enterprises.

Reviewing ilterature on the micro impacte of macroeconomic polloies, Lambarte, et. al. (1991) concluded that there is a need to etudy the impact of new policies on production units especially in as far as the micro, small and medium scale enterprises are concerned. These production units are typically labor-intensive, they operate outside of Metro Manila area and have some potential for a positive response to a changing macroeconomic environment.

### 1.2. Objectives of the Study

In general, the study aims at analyzing the effects of macroeconomic policies on rural nonfarm enterprises. Specifically, the objectives of the study are the following:

1) To develop an analytical framework to determine the impact of macroeconomic policies on rural nonfarm enterprises (RNEs).
2) To analyze the trends in the growth. of RNEs in the Rhilippines.
3) To determine the changes in government policies towards the development of RNEs.
4) To describe briefly the market for . selected sutpute of RNEs.
5) To measure the effects of price and trade policies on rural nonfarm enterprises.

### 1.3. Organization of the Report

To achieve these objectives, data were gathered from secondary sources. Output and employment data were obtained from the census and annual survey of establishments undertaken by the National Statistice Office. (NSO). The next chapter defines the scope of rural nonfarm enterprises as well as each of these variables. Chapter 2 also presents -the theoretical framework and an analytical submodel for rural nonfarm enterpriees and its linkage with the FIDS NEDA macroeconometric model for the Fhilippine economy developed by Constantino, Mariano, and Yap (1889).

Based on literature on nonfarm enterprises, Chapter 3 briefly describes a sample of different industries while Chapter 4 presents: the various policies that have been formulated and implemented for nonfarm enterprises. Ueing data derived from the NSO survey of establiehments, trends in output, employment, number of establishments, and prices are analyzed in Chapter 5. The next chapter discusses the result of the output, employment, and price equations estimated using the analytical model developed in Chapter 2. The model ie validated and dynamic. simulations are undertaken in Chapter 7 to determine the prformance of the model and the effecte of macroeconomio policies on rural nonfarm enterprises.

CHAPTER 2

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK


#### Abstract

2.1. Definition of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises

Bautista (1991) defined RNES quite generally as "nonagricultural activities producing $Z$ goods whose role in the development of an (initially) agrarian economy has been analyzed in various contexts.". Focusing on microenterprises Lapar (1991) identified rural nonfarm microenterprises in the traditional sector as constituting all income-generating activities carried out by individuals, households and partnerships in rural settinge excluding agriculture- and modern sector activities like agroindustry, mining, commercial services, and infrastructure and sovernment services.


For purposes of this study, the second definition was expanded to include not only microenterprises but also corporations or big enterprises. The National Statistics Office (NSO) conducts an annual survey or census of manufacturing eatablishments throughout the country and since 1975 has reported data for the Philippines as a whole; for Metro Manila, and for the various regions. For this study therefore, manufacturing establishnents regardless of size and located outside Metro Manila were considered rural nonfarm enterprises. This is appropriate as evidenced by the presence of numerous establishments ranging from very small (e.g. less than five workers) to very large enterprises (e.g. more than one thousand workers) in the rural areas. Examples are Asia Brewery, and Nestle Fhilippinee located in barangaye in Cabuyao,. Laguna and another Asia Brewery in a barangay in El Salvador, Misamis Oriental; Philippines Kao in Jasaan, Misamis Oriental; coconut product processors in Quezon; and many others.

The Metro Manila area has been defined by the NSO to compribe Manila, Caloocan City, Pasay City, Quezon City; Valenzuela, Pasig, Las Pinas, Makati, Malabon, Mandaluyong, Marikina, Muntinglupa, Navotae, Farafaque, San Juan, and Taguig. Data on manufacturing establiehments on nonfarm enterprises as defined in this etudy are available for Metro Manila and for Regione I to XII. The data for the regions were then coneolidated to compose rural nonfarm enterprises.

The NSO Annual Survey of Establishments defines manufacturing as the mechanical or chemical transformation of organic or inorganic subetances into new products, whether the work is performed by power-driven machines or by hand, whether it is done in a factory or in the workers ${ }^{-}$ home', and whether the producte are sold at wholeeale or retall. The aseembly of component parte of manufactured products and major repair work are considered manufacturing.

NSO further defines establiehment as an economic unit which engages under a single ownership or control, that is; under a single entity in one or predominantly one kind of activity at a eingle fixed location and having permanency of assets, such as goods for resale, producte, materiale, equipment, etc.. in tite premiees during the operation. Thus an establishment is a plant, mill, factory or shop at a single physical location where a particular manufacturing, fabricating, proceesing and/or aseembling operation ie performed.

Data on number of establishments; value of output, employment, capital expenditures, major cost items, and othere are reported by NSO by industries classified using the Philippine Standard Induetrial Classification of all. economic activities. The major kind of activity of an establishment $1 s$ determined by the proportion of the gross output of the principal products manufactured.

For the present study, rural nonfarm enterprises were grouped into twelve, namely:

1. Food manufacturing

This includes, among others, the slaughter, preparation and preservation of meat; manufacture of proceesed milk and dalry producta; canning, processing and preservation of fruits, vegetables, f1sh, crustaceans, and other seafoods; production' of crude coconut 011, cake and meal, and deselcated coconut; manufacture of vegetables olls and animal oils and fats; rice, corn and flour milling; manufacture of bakery products, sugar milling and refining; manufacture of coooa, chocolate and other sugar confectionery; coffee roasting and processing: manufacture of ioe: and others.
2. Beverage manufacturing

This includes distilling, rectifying and blending spirits; and manufacture of wine, mait liquors, malt, softdrinks, and carbonated water.

## 3. Tobacco manufacturing

This includes the manufacture of cigarettes, cigare, chewing and emoking tobacco; and the curing and redrying of tobacco leaves.
4. Textile, wearing apparel and leather industries (referred to $8 s$ textile in subsequent discussions)

These include spinning, weaving, texturizing and finishing textiles; manufacture of made-up textile goods, wearing apparel, ready-made clothing; manufacture of carpets, rugs, cordage, rope, and twine; custom tailoring and dresemaking shops; manufacture of artificial leather, oil cloth and other impregnated and coated fabrics, fiber batting, padding, and upholstery filling; manufacture of leather, leather substitutes and fur; tanneries and leather finishing; manufacture of leather shoes; and others.
5. Manufacture of wood and wood products including furniture and fixtures (referred to a wood in subsequent discuesions)

This group includes sammills and planing mills; manufacture bf veneer, plywood, hardboard, and particle board; wood drying and preserving plants; manufacture of wooden containers, and wood. carvinge; manufacture and repair of wood furniture, rattan furniture, box beds and mattresses; manufacture of partitions, shelves, lockers, office and store fixtures, window and door screens, shades and venetion blinds; and others.
6. Manufacture of paper and paper products, printing and publishing referred to as paper in subsequent discussions)

This group consists of manufacturers of pulp, paper, and paperboard; printing of newspapers and periodicals; printing and pubilshing of books and pamplets; commercial and job printing; and others.
7. Manufacture of chemicale and chemical, rubber and plastic products (referred to as chemicals in subsequent discussions)

This group includes manufacture of basic induetrial chemicals, fertilizer, eynthetic resins, plastic materials and man-made fibers; pesticides; insecticides, fungicides, and herbicides; manufacture of painte, varnish, lacquers; manufacture of druge, medicines, boap and oleaning preparations; manufacture of tires, tubes, rubber footwear, plastic products, etc.
8. Manufacture of petroleum and coal products (referred to as petroleum in subsequent discuseions)

This includes petroleum refineries and the manufacture of miscellaneous products of petroleum and coal.
9. Basic meṭal industries

These industries consist of iron and steel basic industries such as blast furnaces and steel making furnaces; steel works and rolling mills iron and steel foundries; non-ferroue metal basic industries such as sold and other precious metal refining, nonferrous smelting and refining plants, nonferrous rolling, drawing and extrusion mills; and non-ferrous foundries.
10. Manufacture of fabricated metal products, machineries (except electrical) and transport equipment (referred to as machineries. in subsequent discussions)

This group includes the manufacture of fabricated metal products and furniture and fixtures primarily of metal like cutlery, handtools, general hardware, metal containers, nonelectric lighting and heating fixtures; metal etamping, coating and refining; manufacture of fabricated wire products; manufacture of engines and turbines, agricultural machinery and equipment, metal and woodworking machinery, office, computing and accounting machinery; manufacture of transport. equipment. including shipbuilding and repairs; aircraft, manufacture,
assembly, rebuilding, and major alteration of motor vehicles, motorcycles. and blcycles; manufacture of motor vehicle parts and accessories; manufacture of professional and scientific equipment, photographic and optical instruments, watches and clocks; manufacture and repair of furniture and fixtures primary of metal.
11. Manufacture of electrical machinery, apparatus,
appliances and supplies (referred to as electrical
in subequent discussions)

This includes the manufacture of electrical machinery and apparatus; radio, television, and communication equipment and apparatus; electrical appliances and housewares; primary cells and batteries; electric wires and wiring devices and others.
12. Other manufacturing industries

This includes the manufacture of nonmetallic mineral products such as pottery, ohins, earthware, glass and glass. products. It also includes the manufacture of jewelry and related exticles; musical instruments; sporting and athletic goods; surgical, dental, medical and orthopedic supplies; opthalmic goods, eyeglasses and epectacles; toys and dolls; stationers, artiets and office supplies; and others.

### 2.2. Theoretical Framework

The framework for policy analysis is adopted with some modifications from R.M. Bautista, Dynamics of. Rural Development: Analytical Issues and Policy Perspectives, a report submitted to PIDS in September 1991. A schematic representation of the main relationships underlying the influence of government policies on the economic performance of RNEe is presented in Figure 2.1. Five major policy instruments affecting RNEs are agrarian reform, induetrial policies, price and trade policies, public investment, and monetary, financial, and exchange rate policies. These policies are linked to the product and labor markets of the RNEs as well as the infrastructure and human resources.

According to Bautieta, on the demand elde consumption linkage effects are indicated from hotiseholds and production linkages in the product market. Household incomes and assets, both the absolute level and their distribution, are affected by agrarian reform as well as government

Figure 2.1. A framework for policy analysis of RNEs

investments on physical infraetructure and human resources development. Furthermore, income ie earned by household members participating in any of the two markets.

The product market interacts with the oredit and labor markets. The product market, may also be affected by agrarian reform through the latter s impact on productivity and the different expendituree patterns among large and small landowners, tenants, and landless workers. Moreover, It is influenced by trade and price policies directly through import tariffe, export taxes, etc., and indirectly through the induced changee in the exchange rate. Here, trade policies should coneider both doméstic and international trade polioies including quantitative restrictions.

Monetary and financial policies ciroumscribe developments in the credit markets, in terms of both the magnitude of available domestic credit and its: allocation. Likewise, they affect the labor market through their influence on the interest rate, a major component of the user cost of capital which in part determinee the capitallabor ratio and hence the extent of labor employment.

Agrarian reform can lead to significant changes in the credit market, e.g., a shift in the sourcing of nonformal loans from landlords to traders. In addition, oredit allocation practices of banks may change as the value of land-based collateral declinea. In the labor market, if labor is underemployed in small farms and land is underutilized in large farme, the land distribution could increase labor employment, land use' and farm output, provided that the other input requirements (e.g. seeds, fertilizer, chemicals, etc.) are applied. Labor supply and demand would be affected by the level and composition of the. human capital (a determinant of labor productivity) and the forelgn trade regime. Exchange rate overvaluation and low tariff rates on imported capital equipment have a distortionary effect on relative factor prices that penalize. labor-intensive industriee and the adoption of labor-using production technologies. This weakene the denand stimulus to rural nonfarm production through the induced effects on the product market and the purchasing power of rural households.

On the other hand, the supply response of RNEs is determined by relative prices from the product, labon and credit markets, as well as the availability of factor inputs-capital and labor skills and access to them by rural producere. If the credit market is such that the financing
of fixed capital investment and of working capital, or if public investment is distorted against expenditures on health, education, and the development of labor skills in rural areas, the growth performance of KNE will be hampered. The effects of market changes on rural nonfarm production are also determined by the existing physical infrastructure in rural areas, which may or may not permit low-cost marketing to take place. A strong anti-rural blas in . infrastructure policy, for example, is likely to impair the ability of rural producers to respond to favorable price and demand conditions.

Furthermore, the growth in RNEs - both in terms of the existing establishment of new RNEs and the eustainability of exieting ones -will-be affected by industial policies, e.g. the various incentives provided by the government. It will also be influenced by the extent of the generation and dissemination of new technology particularly .those which have direct bearing on increasing output and productivity and reducing cost of production.

In order to eatimate the quantitative effect of some macroeconomic policies on rural nonfarm enterprises, a submodel for volume of output, employment and prices was formulated. The submodel is to be linked to the PIDS NEDA Macroeconometric Model (MEM) developed by Constantino, Mariano and Yap (1989). The RNE bubmodel follows a similar theoretical framework as that of the PIDS NEDA MEM. The macro model divides the production categories into (a) "fixprice," (b) "flexprice," and (c) "flexprice/flexquantity" sectors. The flexprice/flexquantity sector has flexible output and prices to clear the market, the fixprice sector has an adjusting output level with fixed prices while the flexprice sector has fixed output and adjusting prices.

Constantino, et al state that the fixprice sector is most applicable to the induetrial sector which is often characterized by excess capacity and therefore, adjustments to increases in demand take place on the quantity side. Industrial pricee are likely to be fixed in the short-run by relatively stable markups over variable cost. Markups can be justified by the presence of spare capacity and oligopolistice structures. On the other hand, excess capacity can be justified by lack of effective demand both in the domestic and the international markets.

The PIDS NEDA model consists of four major blocks: (1) the real sector, (2) the fiscal sector, (3). the financial sector, (4) the external sector. The real sector block is further subdivided into three subsectors, namely: (1)
production, (2) expenditure, and (3) employment, wages and price. Consisting of 169 equations, the model incorporates key aspects which have special significance for analyzing the impact of macroeconomic policies such as the following: (1) changee in government expenditures or deficit: (2) effect of money on prices and output: (3) 1mpact of debt service and foreign löan or assistance on economic performance; (4) role of the exchange rate and interest in the adjuetment of the economy; and (5) the dual role of capital formation, demand generation in the short run and capacity creation for increased supply in the long run.

The interactions anong the blocks may be described as followe:
"The linkage between the production sector and expenditure sector moves only in the four aggregate 'expenditures categories appearing as arguments in the demand functions in the production sector. Output as determined then enters into the employment equation.

The financial and real sectore interact through the interest rate and through the price variablee. as some monetary aggregates affect prices.

The fiscal sector is essentially exogenous in the basic model, specially with respect to government expenditures. However, tax revenues are linked to the level of economic activity or output. To the extent that it is monetized, the sovernment budget deficit serves as the link with the financial sector.

The external sector links up with the rest of the economy through financial variables specifically, net forelgn assets. This is in addition to the link between the expenditure/production side, i.e. exports and imports with the current account componente.".

### 2.3. Analytical Model

### 2.3.1. Demand Functions

Demand for output of each RNE is characterized as a function of its price and indicators of aggregate domestic and international demand. Thus, the demand for the producte of each RNE sector is assumed to be a function of 1 te price, coneumption expenditure, population and exports. That is,

```
Q = f(P, CP or CG or CP + CG; X , POP)
```

where:

```
Q = Demand for RNE sector 1
    P = Implicit price index for industrial sector i
    CP = Personal consumption expenditures
    CG = 'Government consumption expenditures
    X = Real exports of Induetrial producte 1
    POP = Population
```

It is hypothesized that the coefficient of $P$ would be negative, that of consumption expenditures would be positive, that of population is positive, and that of exports ie positive.

Specifically, the following equations for each RNE group were aseumed to characterize the sector demand:

Industry Group.
Food - (1) QFOOD $=f($ PFOOD $, C P+C G, D V 8489)$
Beverage (2) QBEV =f(PBEV, CP + CG)
Tobacco (3) QTOB $=f(P T O B, C P ; X T O B)$
Textile (4) QTEX $=\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{PTEX}, \mathrm{CP}, \mathrm{POP})$
Wood (5) QWOOD $=\mathrm{f}($ PWOOD, CP, DV8486
Paper (6) QPAP $=f(P P A P, C P+C G)$

Chemicals (7) QCHEM $=\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{PCHEM}, \mathrm{CP}, \mathrm{XCHEM})$
Petroleum (8) QPET $=\mathrm{f}(P \mathrm{PET}, \mathrm{CP}+\mathrm{CG}, \mathrm{XPET}, \mathrm{TIME})$
Basic Metals (9) QBSM $=f(P S B M, P O P)$
Machinery (10) $\mathrm{QMACH}=\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{PMACH}, \mathrm{CP}+\mathrm{CG}, \mathrm{XMACH})$
Electrical (11) QELEC $=\mathbf{f}($ PELEC, POP, XELEC)
Others (12) QOTH =f(POTH, CP+CG), POP)
where:

| QBEV | real GVA of the rural food industry real GVA of the rural beverage induetry. |
| :---: | :---: |
| QTOB | real GVA of the rural tobacco industry |
| QTEX | real GVA of the rural textile industry |
| QWOOD | real GVA of the rural wood industry |
| QPAP | real GVA of the rural paper industry |
| QCHEM | real GVA of the rural ohemical industry |
| QPET | real GVA of the rural petroleum industry |
| QBSM | real GVA. of the rural baeic metale Induetry |
| QMACH | real GVA of the rural machinery industry |
| QELEC $=$ | real GVA of the rural electrical industry |
| QOTH | real GVA of the other rural nonfarm industries |
| PFOOD $=$ | implicit price index for GVA of food manufacturing |
| PTOB | implicit price index for GVA of tobacco induetries |
| PTEX | implicit price index for GVA of textile industries |


| PWOOD | implicit price index for GVA of wood manufacturing |
| :---: | :---: |
| PPAP | implicit price index for GVA of paper menufacturing |
| PCHEM $=$ | implicit. price index for GVA of chemical manufactuxing |
| PPET | implicit price index for GVA of petroleum manufacturing |
| PBSM | implicit: price index for GVA of basic metal manufacturing |
| $\mathrm{PMACH}=$ | 1mplicit prise inder for GVA of machinery manufacturing |
| PELEC $=$ | implicit price index for GVA of electrical manufacturing |
| POTH | implicit price index for GVA of other industries |
| CP | private consumption expenditure |
| CG | government expenditure |
| POP | population |
| $\mathrm{XTOB}=$ | exports of tobacco manufacture |
| XCHEM $=$ | exports of manufactured chemical producte |
| XPET | exports of petroleum and coal proaucts |
| $\mathrm{XMACH}=$ | exporta of manufactured machinery products |
| XELEC $=$ | exports of manufactured electrical producte |
| DV8486 = | dummy variable equal to 1 for 1984 to 1986 and 0 otherwise |
| DV9489 = | dummy variable equal to 1 for 1984 to 1989 and 0 otherwise |

As defined earlier, the $Q$ refer to the GVA of each 1' 8 eector of the rural nonfarm enterpriees while prices reflect the average price for Metro Manila and rural areas, that is, for the Philippines as a whole. Similarly, exports could not be segregated into rural and Metro Manila and therefore export values are aggregated figures. The same is true for private and government consumption expenditures. Furthermore, population refers to total philippine population as products of RNEs enter not. only the rural markets but aleo those of Metro Manila.

It should be noted that dumm variables were added as a dependent variable in some equations to reflect the crisis situation in the mid 1980s. As will be seen. in the analybis of historical trends in GVA, there were changes in patterns Immediadedy atter-1983. : The chenge could be phott-lived, e.g. up to 1986 or longer term up to 1989. The dummy variables were included to take account of factors not otherwise captured by other arguments in the equation. In some caeee, time trend was also added as a catch-all variable.

In the actual estimation of the equation, pricee appeared as the lmplicit price per se or deflated by the consumer price index (CPI)
s

### 2.3.2. Employment Function

Assuming a specific production technology, traditional neoclassical theory of demand for labor hypothesizes it as positively related to the demand for output on production, negatively to ite own price, 1.e. to wage rate, and positively to prices of substitute inputs. Mathematically, the equation can be expressed generally as followe:

$$
L_{f}=f\left(Q_{f}, \text { WAGE, INT }\right)
$$

where:
L = employment in FNE sector 1
1

- WAGE $=$, wage rate

INT $=$ interest rate
It is hypothesized that $Q$ would have $Q$ positive 1
coefflolent, wage a negative coefficient and interest a poeitive coefficient. That is, as output increases, more labor would be employed but an increase in the wage rate could bring about a reduction in the amount of labor
employed. A substitute input is capital which is relatively scarce, hence an increase in interest rate or the price of capital would reduce desired capital and increase labor demand. In estimating the equation the capital input was represented either by the nominal or real value of treasury bill ratee or the amount of additional investment that each RNE sector makes during the year.

The following employment functions were therefore estimated for each RNE sector:
(1) LFOOD $=f($ QFOOD, WAGE, KFOOD $)$
(2) LBEV $=f($ QBEV, WAGE, KBEV $)$
(3) LTOB $=f(Q T O B$, WAGE, TBILL)
(4) LTEX $=f(Q T E X, W A G E, K T E X)$
(5) LPAP $=\mathrm{f}($ QPAP, WAGE, TBILL, DV8489)
(6) LWOOD $=f(Q W O O D$, WAGE, KWOOD, DN8489)
(7) LPET $=f($ QPET, WAGE, TBILL)
(8) LCHEM $={ }^{\prime} f(Q C H E M$, WAGE, TBILL-INFL)
(9) LBSM $=f(Q B S M$, WAGE, TBILL-INFL)
(10) LAMCH $=\mathbf{f ( Q M A C H , ~ W A G E , ~ K M A C H , ~ D V 8 4 8 9 ) ~}$
(11) LELEC $=f($ QELEC, WAGE, KELEC $)$
(12) LOTH $=f($ QOTH, WAGE, DVB489)
where:
LFOOD: = employment in the rural food industry
LBEV $=$ employment in the rural beverage induetry
LTOB $=$ employment in the rural tobacco induetry
LTEX $=$ employment in the rural textile induatry
LWOOD = employment in the rural wood industry
LFET $=$ employment in the rural petroleum induetry
LCHEM = employment in the rural chemical industry
LBSM $=$ employment. in the rural basic metal industry

| LOTH | $=$. employment in the other rural ind |
| :---: | :---: |
| WAGE | $=$ dally wage rate |
| KFOOD | ```= capital expenditureb in the rurel food Induetry``` |
| KBEV | $\begin{aligned} & =\quad \text { capital expenditures in the rural beverage } \\ & \text { industry } \end{aligned}$ |
| KTEX | ```= capital expenditures in the rural textile.``` |
| KWOOD | $\begin{aligned} & =\text { capital expenditures in tne rural wood } \\ & \text { industry } \end{aligned}$ |
| KMACH |  induetry |
| ELEC | $=$ capital expenditures in the rural electrical industry |
| TBILT | $=$ nominal.rate for treasury bille |
| INFL | $=$ Inflation rate |

Employment has been defined earlier as the number of all workers in each RNE sector. The real GVA entered the equations either as the real value per se or the percentage growth rate between any two successive years.

As defined in the NSO annual survey of establishments, capital expenditure for fixed assets include "cost of acquisition of new and used fixed agsets produced by the eetablishment for its own uee, major alterations, additione and improvements to fixed aseets, whether done by others or done on own account." Therefore, these are annual investments by the induetiry and would be expected to have a positive relationshif with employment.

### 2.3.3. Price Functions

Sector prices are modelled directly as a function of the wholesale price index. These equations provide the linkage to the other sectors in the macroeconometric model. In the PIDS NEDA model, the wholesale price index is determined by a pricing rule characterized by etable markups over variable cost in the short run. A firm's variable inputs will typically comprise of labor and imported inputs. The mark-up rate is influenced positively by capacity
utilization rates of firms. In the formulation of the MEM, increases in demand are proxied by average liquidity divided by potential GNP. The presence of a capital stock index provides the link fron increased investment expenditures to increased production.

In general therefore, the price function may be deacribed mathematically as

```
            \(\mathrm{P}=\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{WPI})\)
where:
WPI = wholesale price index
```

For some sectors, the kagged sentor grtces influenced
 becomes

$$
P_{1}=f\left(W P I, P_{1-1}\right)
$$

The price functions that were eetimated are the following:
(1) PFOOD $=f(W P I)$
(2) PBEV $=f(W P I$, PBEV )
(3) $\mathrm{PTOB}=\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{WPI}, \mathrm{PTOB}$
(4) PTEX $=f\left(W P I\right.$, PTEX $^{-1}$ )
(5) PWOOD $=f\left(W P I ; P W O O D^{-1}\right)$
(6) PPAP $=\mathrm{F}$ (WPI)
(7) $\mathrm{PCHEM}=\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{WPI})$
(8) PPET $=\mathrm{f}$ (WPI, PPET )
(9) $\mathrm{PBSM}=\mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{WPI}, \mathrm{PBSM}^{-1}\right)$
(10) $\mathrm{PMACH}=\mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{WPI}, \mathrm{PMACH}{ }^{-1}\right)$
(11) PELEC $=f($ WPI $)$
(12) POTH $=\mathrm{f}$ (WPI, POTH )

## 

To complete the model, identities were defined. Firet, the sum of the demand for each RNE sector ehould be equal to the total demand for all sectiors, that 1 B ,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { QRNES }= & \sum_{i=1}^{12}, \quad Q \\
= & \begin{array}{l}
\text { QFOOD }+ \text { QBEV }+ \text { QTOB }+ \text { QTEX }+ \\
\\
\\
\text { QPAP }+ \text { QMACH }+ \text { QEDEC }+ \text { QCHEM }+ \text { QBSM }+
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

 employment in all RNEs must also be equal to the sum of employinent in all sectore, thus,


$$
\begin{aligned}
= & \text { LFOOD }+ \text { LBEV }+ \text { LTOB }+ \text { LTEX }+ \text { LPAP }+ \\
& \text { LWOOD }+ \text { LCHEM }+ \text { LPET }+ \text { LBSM }+ \\
& \text { LMACH }+ \text { LELEC }+ \text { LOTH }
\end{aligned}
$$

where: LRNES $=$ total employment in all RNES.
For linking with the macroeconometric model, it is necessary that total demand for output of all nonfarm enterprises be equal to the sum of the demand for output in Metro Manila plus the demand for output in the rural areas. The same holds for employment. Therefore,

| QMFG | $=$ QRNES + QMM |
| ---: | :--- |
| and LMFG | $=$ LRNES + LMM |
| where: QMFG | $=$ total demand for ouput of |
| manufacturing |  |
| $=$ | demand for output of Metro Manila |
| QMM | $=$ total employment in nontarm |
| $=$ | enterprises |
| LMFG $=$ | employment in nonfarm enterprisea |
|  | located in Metro Manila |

### 2.3.5. Estimation Method

The above systems of equations may be classified as Seemingly Unrelated Equations model which is a specific type of recursive model consisting of a series of endogenous variables which are considered as a group because they bear a close conceptual relationship to each other (Pindyck and Rubinfeld, 1981). The demand equations represent a set of equations for related products. So does the employment and price equations.

In the demand equations, quantity in one sector is a function of the corresponding price in that sector and other variables such as consumption expenditures, population, etc. The price findex in oneffeto: fopears only once, that is, cont in the ne fevant eqnter men mot me the other thdupt groups.

The price functions were defined such that the sector price index is a function of the wholesale price index and the lagged sector price. For the RNE submodel, the WPI is an exogenous variable elthough it is endogenous in the macro model. The eector price entere as a lagged variable.

Thus, for each block, no endogenous variable appears in more than one equation in which case the error terme of each equation are unrelated or uncorrelated. In such a case ordinary least squares estimation is "quite proper" (Findyk and Rubinfeld, 1981). If the error terme are correlated between equations, mpre efficient estimates can be obtained using more sophisticated eptimation technique, e.g. two stage least squares (TSLS). or the generalized least-squares estimation: The ordinary least squares method was used in estimating the equations in the study. The systems method could have been ueed, however, this will automatically truncate the data series. As it is, the availability of the data on RNES has already limited the number of obeervations; and using the TSLS, for example; to improve the efficiency of the estimates would have shortened the data series. A major consideration aleo is that the PIDS NEDA MEM to which the present model will be linked.

Some modifications were made in derining the variables. As mentioned earlier, eome equations in the demand block used growth rates in the real GVA. Moreover, prices. were deflated by CPI in some equations. Wages were also deflated by the implicit price index for the Grose National product. Treasury Bill rates were aleo expreesed either in nominal or real terms. The macroeconometric model used the: interest rate in time deposits in its initial speoifications. Adjustments were later made to use the Treasury Bill rate
instead whenever this yielded similar on better resulte. It has been observed that the behavior of the interest rate on time deposits closely followed that of TBILL especially when the interest rates were deregulated after 1981.

Availability of data dictated that the real value of GVA use 1972 as the base (There is a complete GVA series for the period 1975 to 1989 using 1972 as base).. Since the more current figures has changed this base year to 1985, bridge equations were estimated.

When necessary, serial correlation was corrected either by adding a lagged dependent variable in the equation or by estimating the equation using the Cochrane Oreutt procedure.

The etructure of the equations in Chapter 6 followe essentially this basic procedure. However, the variables included in an equation depend on a number of considerations, anong them being the economic theory behind the relationshipe and the significance of the variable in the: estimated equation; While economic theory may dictate that a certain variable should be inoluded in the equation, it is possible that the coefficient may turn out to be nonsignificant or the sign ie inconsistent with theory.. The specification of a number of variables could. affect the 2
sign, level of elgnificance, $R$, etc. Hence, a variable is either added or deleted in some equations if the coefficient has the incorrect sign or not significantly different from 2.
zero. An equation is dieregarded if the $R$ is very low. There are different degrees to which this "rule" ie followed. As can be seen from the equations, some variables etill have nonsignificant coefficients. This happens when the exclusion of a variable would adversely affect the coefficients of other variables.

### 2.4. The Data Series on Employment, Output and Prices

The principal data series for the major endogenous variables in the model are output, employment, and prices. Employment and value of output data are avallable from the NSO Census and Annual Survey of Establishments. Here, employment is defined as the total number of persons who work in or for the establiehment, including working ownere and active bueiness partners and unpaid family workers, managers, production workers, and other employees.

Value of output represents the total value of producte adjusted for change in inventories (ending less beginning) of finished products, work-in-process and merchandise for
resale, value of contract work and industrial gervices done for others, value of merchandise resold; cost of fixed assets produced on own account. In the estimation of the equations, gross value added (GVA was ueed to make it consietent with the PIDS NEDA MEM. The GVA for each industry group is available in the NSCB Philippine Statistical Yearbook as an aggregate for the whole Fhilippines. To obtain the GVA for rural nonfarm enterprises, the annual proportion of the value, of, output of each of the annual proportion of the value of output of each of the rural enterprises from the NSO ceneuis and survey was used.

For prices, the implicit price indexes for GVA $c_{1}$ caun industry group was used. These prices refer to the Philippines as a whole and no attempt was made to construct a series for rural nonfarm enterprises:

The study would like to cover as long a series as possible, however the NSO regional statistics started only In 1975. When the data. for the study were being collected, the 1988 and 1989 surveys of establiehments have not been published yet but computer diskettes were already avallable. Data for 1990 are still being processed and therefore could not be included in the present analyeis. The estimates of the equations that analyzed output, employment, and prices, therefore, covered only the period 1975 to 1989. Moreover, the trends in the growth of RNE were diecussed only for the same period.

Some adjustments were made on the data to take acoount of differences in coverage of the NSO Ceneus of Establishments and the Annual Survey of Establishmente (ASE). Where obvious inconsistencies appear, simple averages or growth rates were ueed. For example, data for total employment during a certain year $t$ could be obtained by averaging the figures for the previous ( $t-1$ ) and the succeeding ( $t+1$ ) year. If this total has to be disaggregated between rural and urban and among the 12 induetry groups, then the corresponding distribution obtained from the Census was used. Where the simple average would pose problems (e.g. if there is an apparent inconsistency) in the distribution among induetry groupe, an alternative procedure was to use the growth rate in the previoue few years (two or more) to project the data for a particular year.

## A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DIFFERENT NONFARM ENTERPRISES

based on available Ifterature, this Chapter attemptis to deseribe a few selected nonfarm induetries to provide some background particularly on the structure of the induetry and specific policies affecting thereof.

### 3.1. The Food Industry

The food industry products are generally classified under key commodity areas such as meat and meat preparations, dairy products and egge, cereals and cereal preparation, fruits and vegetables, sugar and honey, beverages and spices, feedstuffs and miscellaneous foods, animal and vegetable oils and fish and fish preparation.

The crop based products include the major traditional exports such as coconut oil and dessicated coconut, sugar, canned pineapple; wheat flour from imported wheat; milled rice from locally produced paddy; corn grits from local and imported corn; cocoa chocolate, and coffee depending basically on imported cacao and locally grown coffee beans.

The meat proceseing industry is occaseionally sufficient in its pork and poultry" requiremente but continuously short in beef supply. The country's dairy processing industry produces canned milk, cheese, ice cream, and other producte from basically imported milk powder. The local dairy industry produces only a small quantity of fresh milk for dairy processing. To make canned filled milk, the industry mixes imported non-fat dried milk powder with coconut and corn o1l.

The processing sector for fiehery products produces mainly frozen marine products for export and canned fish and other seafood items for the local and export markets.

The country's food industry ranges from sophisticated multi-national processing factories to cottage-level operations. Although the latter sector comprisee $90 \%$ of the
total food proceseing factories,it produces only about $30 \%$ of the total output (Hicks, 1991). A number of local food machinery manufacturing companies have harvesters for rice, cassava, and sweet potato; milling machines for rice; sorting and grading equipment; and many cmall-scale items such as slicere, grindere, extendere, etc.

The processing sector may be classified into (a) traditional and (b) modern food processing sector (Aquino, 1991). In the former, the equipment used are mostly locally fabricated. The industry generally produces Western-type processed foods employing established food processing technology and adapting this to local raw materials. . Plant equipment is pllot in scale and production is carried out in batch type of operation in general. In contrast, the modema food processing sector caters mostly to the export market. The major problem encountered in this sector is the fluctuations in the world market price, especially for coconut and sugar.

The food processing industry employs different levels of technology, from simple kitahen scale operation to established technologies. Supplies and other ingredients used such as preeervatives, additives, emulsifiers, flavorings, seasonings, etc, are still basically imported. Packing and packaging materiale are locally fabricated.

Some of the frequently mentioned problems of large processing induetries in the country are as follows (Aquino, 1991):
a. Lack of raw materials for processing;
b. Poor quality of available supply: leannese of cattle, hog and poultry, lack of acceptable grades of fish, improper maturity and variety of fruits and vegetables, mechanical demage during transport, production and related handing problems;
c. The tropical climate contributes to the fast deterioration of perishable raw materials;
d. Grading and standardization is hardly practiced, hence, a large variation in quality prevails;
e. Adequate infrastruoture to bring produce from farms to factories. There are too many. middlemen in the distribution system;
f. High cost of tin cans which are imported; and
g. Increasing production cost, labor and equipment and the weakenng of the Philipplne peso vie-a-vis the US dollar.

On the other hand, Dizon (1983) cited the following problems of small-scale proceseors:
a. Limited market coverage due to limited volume of production, insufficient demand, inadequate eales force, inefficiency of the the local dietribution system, and high perishability. of locally processed products;
b. Widespread uee of middiemen as arstribution channels;
c. Inadequate physical distribution facilities;
d. Pricing problems;
e. Vulnerability to competition, market flexibility and aggressive marketing activities.

It can be observed that small-scale processors face the same problems as those experienced by the large food processing industries.

In the Philippines the domestic food consuming market is large and growing at a rate of about. $2.78 \%$ per annum (Aquino, 1991). Although the average inflation rate in 1991 was about $12 \%$, the inflation rate for food was a bit lower at $11 \%$ albeit varying by commodity.

Table 3.1 shows the value of food product impores ana exports in 1988. On the export side, the top four products were animal and vegetable oils, fruits and vegetables, fish and fishery products, and sugar and honey. On the imports side, the major producte were cereal and cereal producte, dairy and dairy producte, fish and flshery products, and feeding stuff for animals.

Coconut oll and sugar have always been among the country"e top dollar-earners. They have significantly contributed to the national economy in terms of income and employment. In this regard, this section on the marketing aspect of the food manufacturing industry gives a more detailed discussion on the two products. The discussion below is based mainly on the study of Chupungco (1991).

Table 3.1. Value of food product exports and importe, 1988:

| Item | Exporte |  | Imports |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { f.o.b. } \\ & \text { th. } \$ \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & \text { f.o.b. } \\ & \text { th. } \$ 8 \end{aligned}$ | Percent |
| Animal and vegetable oils | 425,990 | 28.15 | 18,002 | 2.52 |
| Vegetables and fruite | 417,812. | 27.61 | 36,848 | 5.15 |
| Fish and fich preparations | 406,701 | 26.88 | 35,393 | 4.95 |
| Sugar, sugar preparations and honey | 83,107 | 5.49 | 20,111 | 2.81 |
| Cereals and cereal preparations | 8,039 | 0.53 | 228,249 | 31.91 |
| Coffee, tea, cocoa, spices, and prepatation thereof | 62,347 | 4.12 | 8,101 | 1.13 |
| Feeding stuff for animals | 35,437 | 4.33 | 166,496 | :3.27 |
| Dairy products and bird's eggs | 931 | 0.06 | 161,442 | :2.57 |
| Meat and meat preparations | 455 | 0.03 | 8,820 | 1.23 |
| Live animals, chiefly for food | 93 | 0.01 | 9,097 | 1.27 |
| Oilseeds and oleaginous fruits | 30,484 | 2.02 | 14,046 | 1.96 |
| Miscellaneoue | 11,682 | 0.77 | 8,807 | 1.23 |
| Total | ,513,078 | 100 | 715,412. | 100 |

Source: NSO, Philippine Yearbook 1989:

### 3.1.1. Cooonut 011

Domestic marketing of coconut involves the movement: of coconuts from the farm to the traders/buyers and finally to end-users such as copra exporters; coconut oil millers/exporters, and coconut desicators/exporters. The oll millers also produce copra cake or copra meal. Some mills refine the crude coconut oil to produce cooking oil and other coconut-based consumer products. Others produce coco-chemicale, charcoal, coir, eto.

In general, the country"s coconut producta, especially coconut oil, suffer from price instability in the world market. ... Although Philippine:coconut oll constitutes about 75\% of the coconut oll in the world market, it accounts for only about five percent of the world fats and oil market. Coconut oil, soybean oil, palm 011, and palm kernel oil are close substitutes and hence, the world demand for coconut oil appeare to be elastic. Price is largely dependent on the interaction of supply and demand forces in the world market (Habito, 1985; Librero, 1971).

The major importers of Philippine coconut products have been the U.S. and Europe. New markets like the Soviet Union and China have been tapped in the more recent periods.

Coconut Qil Marketing and Trade Policies. The import controls in the 1950 and the decontrol program and the consequent retention scheme in the 1960 s somehow affected the coconut industry. Under the retention scheme policy, exporters. Were permitted to retain a portion of their foreign exchange revenue that they could sell at free market rates. The rest should be exchanged at the lower rates, hence, implicitly taxing their exports. Such policy was IIfted in 1965 (Clarete and Roumasset, 1983).

From 1956 to 1974, coconut oil and copra meal exports to the U.S. were within quota limite and were exempted from U.S. dutiee as agreed upon by the Philippines and the U.S. in the Laurel-Langley Agreement.

In 1970, the floating rate policy which was essentially another peso devaluation made exportation profitable, thus prompting the government to explicitily tex the major exports through Repubilc Act No. 6165. The initial plan wae to lower ite rate every year until its removal in 1974. Export taxation was made, however, a permanent policy of the government in 1973, fixing the tax rate at $6 \%$ for copra and

4\% for processed coconut producte. The lower rate for processed products aimed at encouraging coconut processing In the country. In 1979, the tax rate for copra was raised to 7.5\%. Due to low coconut prices, however, the tax on coconut exports was abolished in 1980.

The significant transformation of the coconut industry began with the passage of the Coconut Investment Fund Law or R.A. No. 6260 in 1971 which authorized the collection of the COCOFUND levy at the constant rate of 70.15 per 100 kg . of copra for a period of 10 years, etarting 1 March 1972. The levy collected was used in the P 100 million capitalization of the Coconut Investment:Company and was intended to replace the traditional middlemen (who were perceived to be explottative of farmers), for the industrializetion of the industry, and for manpower development and research (Tiglao, 1980; ILMS, 1981).

The COCOFUND levy paved the way for the collection of another coconut levy, the Coconut Consumer Stabilization Fund (CCSF). The imposition of the CCSF levy at an initial rate of 715.00 per 100 kg . of copra was legalized through P.D. No. 176 -issued on 20 August 1973. P.D. 176 provided also that the levy was to be revoked after one year or after the supply of cooking oll and the prices of basic coconutbased consumer products had stabllized, whichever was earlier. This provision was amended in 1974 through P.D. 414 which added two new uses of the levy, namely, to pay about $90 \%$ of the premium duty and for investment of the Ph1lippine Coconut Authority (PCA). To tax the windfall gains of exporters in 1974, the premium duty was set at $30 \%$ for copra and 20\% for processed coconut products.' This duty was lifted in 1980 (Clarete and Roumaseet, 1983),

The subsidy program had two schemes. For the period 1973 to 1979, 1t provided for direct payment to manufacturers. The actual amount given to the program from CCSF collections varied from $10 \%$ in 1973 to $6 \%$ in 1976 and 20\% in 1978 (Guerrero, 1985; Clarete and Roumasset, 1983). On 19 April 1979, PCA Administrative Order No. 1, Series of 1979 provided for the direct payment to the oil mille of United Coconut Planters Bank (UCPB). Manufacturers and 011 refiners were indirectly subsidized when purchasing copra or crude coconut oil from these m1lls (ILMS, 1981; Clarete and Roumaseet, 1983). The latter scheme had further bearings on the vertical integration program.

Coconut prices declined sharply in 1980, hence P.D. 1699 provided for the suspension of the CCSF levy on 27 May 1980, to resume 45 days thereafter. The Coconut Development

Project Fund was then eetablished and imposed the collection of P600 per metric ton from the first domestic sale of copra. An additional 7400 was paid by the exporter upon application for export clearance (Clarete and Roumaseet, 1983).

The CCSF levy was scrapped in September 1981 only to be restored in October 1981 at $750 / 100 \mathrm{~kg}$. This levy was then renamed the Coconut Industry Stabilization. Fund (CISF) (Guerrero, 1985). In January 1982, the rate was reduced to $732 / 100 \mathrm{~kg}$. Six months later, in July 1982, the coconut levy was finally abolished.

Vertical Integration. The vertical integration program of the coconut industry aimed at making the farmers also tradere, proceesors, and bankers. It had the following components: a) the establishment of the UCPB, b) the creation of the United Coconut Oil Millb, Inc. (UNICOM), c) the launching of the Philippine Coconut Producers Federation (COCOFED), and d) the eetabliehment of the COCOFED Copra Marketing Center (COCOMARK) and the United Coconut Chemicals, Inc. (UNICHEM). In 1975, the First United Bank was purchased to fund the UCPB. Habito (1985) noted that 70 percent of UCPB's equity was acquired by the. PCA in behalf of the farmers through the levy funds (Farmers were entitled to recelve stock shares in the bank upon presentation of registered COCOFUND receipte). UCPB became the depository of the CCSF revenue, interest free, and was instrumental in the purchase of coconut oil mills and the creation of the UNICOM, COCOMARK, and other entities: It was also intended to address the oredit needs of the industry.

The UNICOM was established in 1979 to adjust the coconut industry's milling capacity to more realistic levels. In the late 1970s, there was an over investment in coconut ofl mills as a response to incentives granted by the Board of Investmente. . In 1979, however, copra production was quite low, resulting in a fierce competition for the available copra among ofl millers, copra exporters, and refiners (Habito, 1985). This led in turn to a very low utilization and financial difficulties of mills. Hence, UNICOM engaged in and coordinated buying, selling, milling, and refining of coconut products and became the largest seller/exporter of copra and coconut : Oll, thus limiting market competition in the milling sector, marketing of copra and coconut oil. An export trade monopoly had virtually arisen.with the establishment of UNICOM.

Although UNICOM professed to give farmers higher prices; prices fell below competitive levels. It is not clear however whether theee low prices were the result of UNICOM's exercise of monopsony power or of marketing inefficiencies resulting from UNICOM policy (Habito, 1985). By 1982, UNICOM controlled $93 \%$ of mililng capacity and $80 \%$ of coconut oil exports. Due to pressures from the International Monetary Fund (IMF), UNICOM was abolished in 1985 to make way for the restructuring of the oil milling induetry.

In 1982, the UNICHEM, a subsidiary of the UCPB group of companies, was establlshed to produce and market locally and internationally semi-proceseed materials for the manufacture of cobmetios, soaps, edetergente, pharmaceuticals, explosives, etc.

The implementation of the vertical integration program rested on the PCA, the COCOFED, and the UCPB.

Copra Export Ban and Export Taxes. The severe drought in 1982 which considerably reduced coconut and copra output which in turn led to increased competition for copra (making copra export prices lower than average millgate prices), prompted the government to impose the copra export ban. Originally intended for a short period the ban was extended to promote coconut oil exports but was lifted in March 1986 because of the short run glut in the copra market. Considered a positive development, allowing copra exporte would reduce oil millers profit margine on copra purchases and may eventually drive the more inefficient mills out of business (Habito, 1986).

Export taxes on copra were inetituted in 1970 to absorb the windfall gains of the exporters from the peso devaluation but were supposed to be phased out by 1974. The Tariff and Customs Code of 1973 made these taxes permanent, however, presumably for revenue reabons. AB of 1986 , export taxes on coconut products comprised the following:

| Product | Export Duty |  | Additional |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Copra |  | Total Duty |  |
| Coconut O11 | $7.5 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ |  |
| Copra meal/cake | $4.0 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Desicated coconut | $4.0 \%$ | 0 | $5.0 \%$ |
|  |  | 0 | $4.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

ine coconut export dan was Llited Dy L.U. No. y wnicn also lowered the additional duty on copra to $2.5 \%$ making the total duty on copra equal to $10 \%$. In July 1986, all export duties on agricultural commodities, including coconut. producte, were aboliehed through E.O. No. 26 (UCAP, 1987).

Trade Barriers in the World Market. In the world market, PCA (1988) underscores the tariff and non-tariff barriers facing the coconut industry such as:
a. Campaign against coconut 011 by the American Soybean Association (ASA) which clalms that eaturated olle such as coconut oll raises cholesterol levele.
b. Levy on vegetable olle and fats entering the European mariset. The European Economic Community (EEC) eetabliehed a price support mechanism in 1987 to finance agricultural programe on the oil seeds and seed olls sector. This tax which would be levied on oils and fats intended for edible useb, would reduce copra price in Philippine ports by ae much as $43 \%$. This tax is expected to be shouldered by the farmers.

### 3.1.2. Sugar

Fifty-six to 60 percent of sugar is produced in Negros and Panay Islands, while 50 to 60 percent 18 consumed in Metro Manila (Pabuayon and Catelo, 1987):

In 1946, the Philippine-American Trade Agreement Act (later amended by the Laurel-Langley Agreement) provided for a fixed Philippine annual quota of 952,000 short tons for the years 1946 to 1973 and 476,000 short tons from 1 January 1974 to 3 July 1974; duty-free entry of Philippine sugar to U.S. for the first eight years and for graduated tariffs for the years thereafter.

From the early postwar years till 1962, the exchange rate was fixed at P2.00/US\$. The peso devaluation in 1962, affected a substantial increase in the peso price of sugar exporte to the U.S. relative to the domestic consumer price. Export prices doubled while the increase in Manila wholesale price was lese than 50 percent (Neleon and Agcao111, 1983).

When the U.S. stopped sugar purchases from Cuba in 962, the Philippine basic quota was Increased, first to . 05 million short tons and then to 1.126 million short tons n 1965. The country received additional export intitlemente of up to 47 percent of export deflcits of other 1.S. suppliers (Pabuayon and Catelo, 1987). The rise in the sebo prices of exports and the growth in export demand made exporte more attractive. However, sugar production and sroductivity did not improve and between 1962 and 1973 spporte to the U.S. were below 95 percent of the quota in Eour out of 12 yeare (Neleon and Agcaoili, 1983).

The imposition of a 10 percent export tax, together Fith enother devaluation of the peso in 1970, caused export arices to increace even more than consumer prices. During the period 1962 to 1973 , the difference between export and soneumer prices was 30 percent on the average.

When the Laurel-Langley Agreement expired in 1974, the government controlied domestic and export marketing. Jovernment intervention then became crucial in making structural adjustments in the industry as well as in protecting consumers and producers from price fluctuations.

The Philippine Exchange Company, Inc. (Philex), a aubeldiary of the Philippine: National Bank (the major financial institution for the sugar industry during that time) was designated as the sole buyer and exporter of sugar. Philex buying price was a composite price computed by taking the weighted average of the officially determined prices of sugar for export, for the domestic market, and for reserve. (The export price component of the composite price referred in general to the world price such that when world price decreases/increases, the composite price decreabes/ increasee holding other factore the eame.). Sugar for the domestic market was sold by Philex to licensed traders.

In 1973-1974, world pricee were quite high such that the probleme ascociated with the termination of the U.S. quota were not quite felt. An additional export tax was impoeed and then a temporary export ban was implemented, however, in late 1974 to protect domestic consumere.

In anticipation of a further rise in world prices after 1974 Fhilex hoarded large quantities of sugar but world pricea went down instead to a record low during the period 1975 to 1979. Substantial losses. Incurred prompted the government to tranefer fhilex control of sugar to the Fhilippine Sugar Commission (PHILSUCOM), a policy~making body created in 1978 which had the National Sugar Trading

Corporation (NASUTRA) as its trading arm. NASUTRA had a network of liceneed traders/wholesalers authorized to trade In sugar and withdraw eugar from the mill warehouses. As of December 1984, 195 tradere nationwide were registered with FHILSUCOM most of whom operated in Metro Manila, a major consuming area, and Negros Docidental, a major producing area.

Apparently, NASUTRA acted as another middleman in the induetry. NASUTRA, fortunately, made profite when world prices roee in 1979 and 1980. It entered into long-term contracte with importers in 1980 to export $565,000 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{t}$. of sugar at 23 cents per pound for crop years 1980-81. through 1983-84. During thie period, world price averaged 10 cents fer pound (Pabuayon and Catelo, 1987).

For the first time after World War II, the Philippines imported 287,238 m.t. of sugar in 1983-84, most of which came from Thailand, Brazil, and Argentina. The sugar ehortage in the country was brought about by low production (from 2.46 million m.t. In 1982-83 to $2.33 \mathrm{~m} 11110 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{t}$. in 1983-84) due to high production costa, financial difficultiee, and the 1983 drought.

After the long-term contracte with foreign buyers, the eugar induetry wae confronted with more serious problems, such as:
(1) U.S. 1mports of Philippine sugar declined while buying eugar at 20 cente per pound. U.S. limited its purchases to about $360,000 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{t}$. In 1984, further declining to $310,000 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{t}$. In 1985 and to $210,000 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{t}$. in 1986 . The remaining exportable sugar had to be sold in the free market at 5 to 6 cents per pound in 1984, 2 to 2.5 cents per pound during the later part of the Marcos regime and at about 7 .cents per pound in 1986.
(2) The problems of declining U.S. imports of Philippine sugar and low world market price were exacerbated by unfavorable developments in the international market such as the utilization of substitute sweetener products, the continuing increase in worldwide production, and depressed globel demand.

Although export marketing was still handled by the government, free domeetic trading was allowed in 1984, and NASUTRA became just another trader. Its immediate result was more competition and lower retail pricee even with lower production.

### 3.2. The Beverage Industry

The Philippine Standard Industrial Claselfication (PSIC) defines the beverage industry to cover the manufacture and marketing of ilquors, wines, beers, colas and carbonated water. These are uaually bottled and canned drinks. Although coffee, chocolate and cocoa, fruit juices and fruit based drinke (e.g. Hi-C, Zesto, Sunkist; Magnolia, etc.) and milk are also beverages according to use, the PSIC places them under food proceseing.

The country's large consumption of beverages has made the beverage bector a relatively large component of the manufacturing induetry. In 1982, a total of more than 4.9 billion bottled drinke were produced/eold by San Miguel Corporation, Aeia Brewery, Coca-Cola, and Pepai-Cola implying an annual per caplta coneumption of around 98 bottlee, 49 of which were eoftdrinke (IBON Databank Philippinee, Inc., 1985). On the average, a Filipino male was estimated to coneume 96 bottles of beer annually.

The first modern brewery in. Southeast Asia wae eatablished in 1890 as a one plant single-product firm. It grew to become the food and beverage giant, the San Miguel Corporation (SMC) which enjoyed a monopoly of beer production in the country until 1979 when Asia Brewery, Inc. (ABI) entered the industry.

During the American colonial period, U.S. soft drinks, Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola, were introduced into the country. The two firms have alwaye been struggling for market leadershif. Tranenational corporatione were a dominant force in goft drinke and non-Filipinoe had a eignificant preeence in beers and liquore. The third soft drink company in the Philippines les the Cosmos Bottling Corporation.

Coca-Cola Bottlere Fhilippines, Inc. started operations in June 1981 as a joint venture of SMC with $70 \%$ equity and the Coca-Cola Export Corporation (TCCEC) with $30 \%$ equity. Prior to 1981 , SMC held the franchise to bottle Coca-Cola producte. TCCEC wes a bubsidiary of the Coca-Cola Company of Atlanta, Georgia, USA and manufactures the syrup concentrate for the company e drinke.

Pepai-Cola Bottling Company of the Philippines and ite supplier of eyrup concentrates, the Pepsi-Cola Far East Trade Development Company, Inc. were eetabliehed in 1946 and 1958, respectively. They were both wholly-owned subsidiaries of the American PepsiCo International.

In March 1985, however, Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co.; of the Philippines sold its botting and distribution facilities to a group of Filipino bueinesemen (IBON Databank, Philippines, Inc.," 1985). The local company however would continuously receive eupport from Pepaico in terms of marketing and technical aesietance.

The No. 3 softdrink company in the Philippines, Cosmos Bottling is about $40 \%$ allen-owned and produces local brands such as Sarei, Pop Cola and Sunta Orange.

### 3.2.1. Method of Producing Beverages.

A typical soft drink plant has the following phases of production: compounding of ingrediente, water treatment, carbonation, bottling or canning, packing, and distribution (Sunga, 1985). Most of the equipment used in a fully integrated bottling ine for softdrink manufacture are imported machineries built according to specifications from the decaser, bottle washer, bottle inepector, filler and capper, deaerator, syrup and water proportioner, up to the refrigeration and carbonating unite.

From the data gathered by IBON Databank. Phllippines, Inc. (1985), the ingrediente of a typical soft drink are purified water, carbon dioxide gas, flavoring, edible acids and coloring.

Beer, on the other hand, is made by the alcoholic fermentation of malted cereal. Winee and epirita are the reault of the fermentation or distillation of fruit juices and cereals like rice, corn, barley, wheat and rye.

### 3.2.2. Consumers of Beverages

Imported champagne, brandy, vodka, and the like are highly priced that they are consumed mostly by well-off drinkers (IBON Databank, Philippines, Inc., 1985). The price of locally manufactured liquors are much lower, hence, such liquors are patronized in general by adult males in the lower income brackets. Local fruit based wines are usually bought by higher income sectore. Beer consumers are mainly the middle and low income groups. Soft drinks are consumed by all sexes and all ages

### 3.2.3. Market-Structure

The NSO Census of Establishments had a record of 102 establishments in the beverage industry in 1978. However, the 1978 Directory of Establishments identified only 85 plants or establishments. One firm owned as many as 11 plants whereas another had nine. These plante were found in 19 provinces in 11 regions of the country (IBON Databank Philippinee, Inc., 1985).

Dominated by a mall number of firms, the beverage induetry may be oharacterized ab oligopolietic, 1.e. a relatively few eellere of 1 dentical or minimally differentiated producta. It must be noted though, that the beer sector was monopolietic until 1979.

IBON Databank Philippines, Inc. (1985) 1dentified two dietinguiehing features of an oligopoly, namely interconnectednees and mutual dependency of firms. One company ie not likely to make a move without coneidening how it may affect competitore and how they are likely to react. Rivalry continue though with some limits on competition to avoid losbes.

The oligopolistic structure of the industry makes entrance into the beverage induatry difficult. Large capltalization is required and risks are great. The firms try to outbell each other by waging masbive advertising and marketing campaigns expenses for which could amount to a significant portion of the total cost of production.

### 3.3. The Tobacco Industry

W1th the exception of direct exports of unmanufactured tobacco, tobacco ie an input in the production of a final product, either cigarettes; cigars, or pipe tobacco.

Essentially, two markets exist for tobacco, one for leaf tobacco and the other for tobacco producte of which the key subsector is cigarette manufacturing. In the local market, the former eerves the cigarette manufacturers while the lattex caters to coneumers in the domestic and international markete. Hence, leaf tobacco can elther be processed into cigerettes or exported to manufacturers in other countries.

Individuals, groupe, and institutions that have interest in the industry include farmers, middlemen/agents, trading centers, wholesale tobacoo dealers, redrying plantb, importers/exporters, olgar and olgarette manufacturers, local communitiee of tobacco growing areas, and the government in particular, the National Tobacco Administration (NTA).

There were 12 wholeeale tobacco dealers (WTDs) in 1989 , seven in Virginia tobacoo and the others in burley and native tobacco. WTDe are suppoeed to purchase tobacco only from trading centere. Four of the Virginia WTDs have albo redrying planta. About $60 \%$ of the total Virginia tobacco supply 18 handled by two WTDb, the Northern Tobacco Redrying Corporation and the Orient Leaf Corporation.

In 1989, 14 companies were classified as importere/exporters engaged in the international trade of tobacco leaf, clgars, cigarettes, and other tobacco products. A total of 11 olgar and cigarette manufacturers were reported in 1989. Seven produced native cigars and eigarettes, two, aromatic or American-blend cigarettes, and one, aromatic and native olgars and cigarettes.

Cigar and oigarette manufacturere produced 69.72 billion eticks in 1989 with aromatic or American - blend oigarettes dominating production and ehared $91 \%$ of the total. The local cigarette market le likewise dominated by aromatic elgarettes which accounted for $93 \%$ of the total demand in 1990. Of the 11 cigar and cigarette manufacturers 1t 1s estimated that two companlee, Fortune Tobecco Corporation and La Suerte Cigar and Cigarette, control 90\% of the market, for aromatio oigarettes.

### 3.3.1. Sources of Growth of the Tobacco Industry

The major source of growth of the tobacco industry has been the domestic market where apparent demand for leaf has grown at the rate of $6.6 \%$ per year over the twenty year period 1970 to 1990.

Native tobacco production has declined at an annual rate of $38 \%$ in the 1970 s only to recover slightly by $1.4 \%$ per year in the 1980s. Virginia tobacco which was initially grown in the 1960 g grew at the rate of $6.4 \%$ per year at its early yeare but growth slowed down to only $0.4 \%$ in the 1970s. This can poseibly be explained by the effect of the
monopoly on farmers incentive to improve production (EYIFICS, 1991).

Export of unmanufactured tobacco grew by almost $10 \%$ in the 1970 s but imports have been increasing by almost twice that rate (Table 3.2). In the 1980 s exporta declined slightly but importe continued to increase, in fact more than doubling or even tripling that of exports.

On the other hand, local'cigarette demand increased by 2.13\% on the average from 1977 to 1980. The surge in import demand and the rise in the deficit was reported to coincide with the increase in cigarette consumption. The average growth of consumption rose by $2 \%$ for the period 1980 to 1985 to $2.75 \%$ for the period 1985 to 1990.

### 3.3.2. Contribution of the Industry to Gross Domestic Product and to Government Revenue

The share of tobacoo manufacture to gross domestic product declined from 1.68\% in 1970 to $0.91 \%$ in 1980 to $0.58 \%$ in 1990. While the importance of the tobacco manufacturing induetry appeare to be waning, excise taxee collected from the industry, increaced from $\$ 1.3$ billion in 1980 to about 77.0 billion in 1990 (Table 3.2). From 1981 to 1990 , taxes rose by $20 \%$ for Virginia and $11.4 \%$ for native tobacco annually. Considering the period 1981-1985 and 1986-1990, excise taxes increased more rapidly from $10.7 \%$ to $14.1 \%$ for native tobaceo and $18.3 \%$ to $23.8 \%$ for Virginia tobacco. It should be stressed though that $99.3 \%$ of the collection in 1990 came from Virginia tobacco cigarettes.

On the other hand, the average exclee tax per etick for native tobacco grew from P0.004 for the period 1981-1985 to po. 008 for 1986-1990. The average excise tax per stick on Virginia tobacco olgarettes went up from 4 centavoe to 10.5 centavos over the period.

Table 3.3 presents the value and growth rates in exporte and imports of unmanufactured tobacco and Virginia e1garettee. Exporte of unmanufactured tobscco grew by 9.56\% and 1mports by $22.08 \%$ in the 1970s. From 1980 to 1990, exporte declined by $.76 \%$ while importe increased by $13.67 \%$. Cigarettee, however, could be a proepective forelgn exchange earner if the performance in the 1980 e to 1990 would continue. Note that elgarette exporte robe from US\$24 thousand in 1981 to US $\$ 3.2$ million in 1985 to US $\$ 7.8$ million in 1989 and suddenly to US\$27.5 million in 1990.

Table 3.2. Net Trade of Tobacco Products, 1970-90 ( nillion US\$).

| Year | EXPORTS (FOB) |  | IMPORTS (CIE) |  |  | NET TRDE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unmanufactured <br> Tobacco | Cigaretteb, Virginia | Unmanufactared Tobacco | Cigarettes, Virginia | Unmanufactured Tobacco | Cigarettes, Virginia | Total Tobacco |
| 1970 | 13.6 | 0 | 7.8 | 0 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 5.8 |
| 1975 | 33.9 | 0 | 19.2 | 0.3 | 14.7 | $\cdot 0.3$ | 14.4 |
| 1980 | 28.8 | 0 | 35.1 | 2.3 | -6.3 | -2.3 | -8.6 |
| 1981 | 48.1 | 0.024 | 41.4 | 3.0 | 6.7 | -3.0 | 3.7 |
| 1982 | 46.7 | 0.7 | 51.8 | 3.7 | -5.2 | -3.0 | -8.2 |
| 1983 | 33.4 | 0.6 | 55.2 | 5.1 | -21.8 | -4.5 | -26.3 |
| 1984 | 28.4 | 1.5 | 27.1 | 2.7 | 1.3 | -1.2 | 0.1 |
| 1985 | 24.2 | 3.2 | 61.5 | 6.1 | -37.3 | -2.9 | -40.2 |
| 1886 | 21.0 | 3.9 | 65.9 | 2.5 | -44.9 | 1.4 | -43.5 |
| 1987 | 18.4 | 3.7 | 95.5 | 2.5 | -77.1 | 1.2 | -75.9 |
| 1988 | 18.1 | 6.5 | 74.1 | 6.2 | -65.0 | 0.3 | -54.7 |
| 1889 | 17.4 | 7.8 | 63.1 | 4.5 | -45.7 | 3.3 | -42.4 |
| 1890 | 20.4 | 27.5 | 60.7 | 6.6 | 40.3 | 20.9 | -19.4 |

Growth Rates:

| $1870-80$ | 9.56\% | H.A. | 22.08\% | N.h. | 3.88 | -0.72 | 3.17 |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1980-90$ | $-0.76 \%$ | $381.19 \%$ | $13.67 \%$ | $27.87 \%$ | -31.93 | 1.25 | -30.68 |
| $1970-90$ | $0.32 \%$ | N.A. | $12.88 \%$ | $3.31 \%$ | -11.26 | -2.92 | -14.18 |

Source: Hational Statistics Office

| Year | Excise Tax |  | Excise Tax Fer Stick |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Native | Virginia | Native | Virginia |
| 1980 | 25 | 1,309 | 0.003 | 0.025 |
| 1981 | 23 | 1,512 | 0.003 | 0.029 |
| 1982 | 20 | 1,679 | 0.003 | 0.029 |
| 1983 | 19 | 1,840 | 0.003 | 0.037 |
| 1984 | 28 | 2,181 | 0.004 | 0.044 |
| 1985 | 37 | 2,985 | 0.005 | 0.061 |
| 1986 | 69 | 5,051 | 0.008 | 0.088 |
| 1987 | 80 | 6,788 | 0.011 | 0.124 |
| 1988 | 45 | 5,872 | 0.007 | 0.099 |
| 1989 | 44 | 6,181 | 0.007 | 0.101 |
| 1990 | 46 | 7,019 | 0.008 | 0.113 |
| 1991. | 18 | 3,884 | 0.007 | 0.129 |
| (Jan-June) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Growth | Rate: | Aver |  |
| 1981-85 | 10.69\% | 18.31\% | 0.004 | 0.040 |
| 1986-90 | 14.11\% | 23.84\% | 0.008 | 0.105 |
| 1981-90 | 11.45\% | 20.05\% | 0.006 | 0.072 |

In 1990, total cigarette exports of the Philippines amounted to US $\$ 28.8$ million while imports amounted to US $\$ 6.6$ million, hence, a large trade surplus. The major countries of destination were Hongkong (for re-export to China) which accounted for $50.07 \%$ in 1990; Taiwan (17.25\%); Saud1 Arabia (14.6\%); and Singapore (11.22\%). Except for one manufacturer, the export of cigarettes 18 primarily controlied by multinationals.

The major markets for unmanufactured Virginia tobacco exports of the country are West Germany, Austria, and the Netherlande. On the import eide, the Philippines obtains most of tobaceo fillers and bindere from the U.5., Belgium, Rhodesia, and Brazil.

Value of elgarette importation increased from U.5.\$2.3 million in 1980 to US\$6.6 million in 1990. In 1980, more than $80 \%$ of cigarette importe came from the U.S. whereas in 1990, a large proportion originated from Hongkong. It is interesting to note that Hongkong is a transhipment point for many producte. It does not grow tobacco nor producee significantiy large amounte of cigarettes.

Using trend analyeis to forecast base growth rates which were then adjusted based on factors such as the extent of anti-smoking campaigns in six countries in Asia, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates that tobacco production in the Philippines would increase by 1.8 percent per annum for the period 1990-1995 and 1.6 percent for 19952000.

Matching this forecast with import and consumption projectione, it beeme that imports would take an increasing share of the total coneumption. FAO estimates that for the Fhilippines tobacco leaf (dry weight) consumption would grow by $4.4 \%$ per year during the period $1990-1995$ and $4.2 \%$ during 1995-2000. Importe, therefore, would be expected to grow more rapldy at 19.8 and 12.0 percent per year respectively for the two periode to meet coneumption requirements. One would note a downward trend in the growth rate of importe and coneumption in the second half of the decade. It ie not clear however if the slowdown would come from a decline in local consumption or a higher growth of exporte.

Quoting estimatee made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Ernst and Young Group (1991) reported that the preference for cigarettes has been falling in developed countriee as shown by the downward trend in cigarette consumption per capita in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Weet Germany, the Netherlands, Austria,

Denmark, Switzerland and Japan. However, the preference for cigarettes is still rising in developing countries such as China and Indonesia. Estimates made by the Ernet and Young Group for the Philippines showed that cigarette consumption is expected to rise from $0.42 \%$ per annum in the late 1980 s to about $0.83 \%$ in the early 1990 s. Greater coneumption per capita 18 expected to occur in the later half of the 1990 e as growth rate inches up to about $1.2 \%$ per year. Adding a population effect of about $2.3 \%$ the Ernst and Young group forecast a total cigarette consumption of about $3.13 \%$ per annum for 1990-1995 and about 3.52\% for, 1995-2000 or an average growth rate of about $3.3 \%$ per annum for the period 1990-2000.

On a worldwide basis, there are both positive and negative factore affecting tobacco and cigarette coneumption. Ae reported by Barford (1991), the positive influences are:. (1) increase in population of smoking age; (2) general improvement in economic climate; (3) rising level of dispoeable incomes; (4) increase in smoking by women; and (5) rapid urbanization in developing countries.

On the other hand, the negative influencee are: (1) high taxation of olgarettee; (2) public attitude to smoking, i.e., emokine bane, reetrainte on marketing, and anti-tobacco propaganda; and (3) increased competition by nontobeceo producte.

### 3.3.3. Policieв

The tobacco industry faces challenges in the immediate future and beyond. Concern for the health hazards of cigar and cigarette zmoking has led a number of government agencies and private organization/groups - the legialative local government units (LGUB), print media, medical groups, the Department of Health - to spearhead the anti-smoking campaign. Local government units prohibit smoking in public places. Ordinances No. NC-73, S-89. which bans smoking in Quezon City was issued in April 1990. The following year this ban became metrowide with the enforcement of Metro Manila Authority (MMA) Ordinance No. 9 and 9-2 in July 1991. These ordinances were amended in August 1991 to provide penalties to those who do not prohibit smoking in designated areas and those who fall to post the required "No Smoking" signe in euch areas.

The Senate and the Lower House have filed several antismoking bills including the following: House Bill (HB) No. 52011 known as the Comprehensive Tobacco Regulation and Education Act of 1988; HB No. 10938 which prohibits the gale of cigarettes to minore and penalizes the violation thereof; HB No. 27762 which bans oigar and eigarette smoking in public conveyance such as jeepneye, buses, LRTs, and commuter traine as well ae in encloed public places euch as schoole, restaurante, movie houses, ehopping malle, and other establiehmente. Bille againet the advertisement of cigare, cigarettes and tobacco derivatives have aleo been filed.

Medical groupe including the Lung Center of the Philippines, the Philippine Cancer Sooiety, the Philippine Medical Association, Doctors for Smoke-Free Philippines, the Philipeine Heart Aeeociation, and othere have been etrongly urging the government to implement a tobacco regulation program that will protect the health of the populace.

A high tax . is levied on elgaretteb. Locally manufactured cigarettes packed in 20 s carrying an International brand name (Locel A) are taxed at $60 \%$ ( $50 \%$ ad valorem plus 10\% VAT), locally manufactured cigarettee with local trademarks and whose wholesale price is 73.60 or h1gher (Local B) 1s.taxed $50 \%$ ( $40 \%$ ad valorem plus $10 \%$ VAT). If locally manufactured cigarettes are priced lower than \$3.60 at wholesale (Local C), they are taxed $25 \%$ ( $15 \%$ ad valorem plus 10\% VAT).

Already approved on third reading by the Senate is House Bill No. 8308 revieing the excles tax base, impoeing rationalized taxes and providing for the reclasalfication of locally manúfactured cigarettes (Manila Bulletin, June 5 , 1993). Cigare will be levied a tax of 10 percent of the index price. Cigarettes packed in thirtiee by hand will be taxed at the rate of $15 \%$ of the Index price or the actual manufacturer'e or importer'e wholesale price, whichever le higher. The eame babie will be ueed for the taxation of cigarettee packed in twenties by machine. Locally manufactured cigarettes which are currently claeeified and taxed at 55 percent or the exportation of which ie not authorized by contract or otherwise, shall be levied a 55 percent tas.

Fears have been expressed by some bectors, however, that the bill will not address the loopholes in the present taxation system but will further entrench the virtual monopoly prevailing in the cigarette induetry (Manila Bulletin, June 8, 1993). The version approved by the Houee
of Representatives imposes a 20 percent levy on the increase over the 1992 income declared by cigarette manufacturers.

### 3.4. The Paper and Paper Products Industry

The paper industry deals with the manufacture from pulp of paper and paperboard which are cut into size or shape and converted into products for uze in induetry and by other consumere. Paperboard is heavier, thicker, and more rigid than paper and is widely ueed for containers and boxes for various commodities. The Philippine Standard Commodity Claselfication (PSCC) considere the product paperboard if the welght per equare meter is greater than 300 grams. Paper 18 usually ued for printing, writing, wrapping, sanitary, etc. while paperboard includee boxboard, chipboard, clayfilled board, bleached board and bristol board (printer's board), coated board (used by olgarette, cosmetic and drug manufacturere as well as the publiehing industry.), contalnerboard, kraftboard, neweboard, tagboard, and specialty board.

### 3.4.1. Establishments in the Industry

In 1980, a total of 241 establiehmente were engaged in the manufacture of paper and paper producte. During that year they had a groes output of 73.12 billion, total employment of 16180 persons, total recelpte of P3.09 billion, and total cost of $\$ 2.70$ billion. Most of the establishments then were paper converters. Based on the 1983' data from PULPAPEL, there were 24 paper milla, 19 of which were PULPAPEL membere. They had a total rated capacity of 550,195 metric tons (Pineda, 1987).

Of the 24 firms, five were integrated pulp and paper/paperboard mille, four were paper and paperboard mille, 13 were purely paper mille, and two were eolely paperboard mille. The total rated capacity of the industry in 1983 ranged from 3960 metric tone for the emalleet firm with a $0.7 \%$ ehare to 184335 metric tons for the biggest firm (PICOP) with a 34\% zhare. The six biggest firme in the induetry accounted for $67 \%$ of the total rated capacity. The remaining 18 firme contributed only $33 \%$. Moet of the firme were located in Luzon, 14 in Metro Manila, 4 in Central Luzon, and 2 in Southern Tagalog. Two firms were in the Visayas and another 2 were in Mindanao (Pineda, 1987).

### 3.4.2. Rew Material for the Industry

The raw materials for the paper industry include long and short fiber pulp, scrap/waste paper, and chemicals. Pulp can be obtained from rice straws, grasses, abaca, rags, agricultural waetes, wood waste, hardwood and softwood epecies.

In the Philippines, the raw materiale ueed by the paper industry include wood, eugarcane bagasse, abaca fibers, waste paper, and imported pulp. Long fiber pulp 18 eourced from abaca due to lack of eoftwood epecies. However, the eupply of abaca is ilmited and ie relatively costly. Hence, it is being used only in producing epecialty papers.

On the other hand, the ahort fiber pulp produced by integrated mille ie eometimes sufflolent but inadequate at other times to meet the needs of the industry. Such shortage therefore hae led to importation of about $60 \%$ of these materials. The induetry aleo has relied heavily on the recycling of ecrap paper for ite input although thie has led to the production of foor quality paper.

Other local sourcee of raw materials (in limited quantities) for paper manufacture are forest resources; the leaves and barks of 1pil-ipil trees; vegetables such as okra and pechay; grasses such as cogon; wastes such as sawdust; cotton lintere; banana stalke; rice stalke; corn hair; bamboo and barke of trees; water hyacinthe; etc.

### 3.4.3. Government Policies and the Paper Industry

The government, in line with its import substitution policy, encourages the growth of the paper industry by providing high protection and incentives in the form of various tax exemptions or reduction. In 1981 and 1982 , importation of the 55 paper producte banned since 1970 was liberalized. Another polioy change wae the Tarlff Reform Program implemented in etages during the period 1981 to 1985 which reduced tariff rates for paper producte from 30-100\% in 1980 to $10-50 \%$ in 1985.

While the government tried to liberalize trade, nontariff. barriers which were more reatrictive than tariff in imiting imports were implemented. Most paper products were regulated in 1982 and 1983 in the form of requirement of
prior 1 mport approval or clearance from the BOI. This import regulation was actually a result of the PULPAPEL petition to protect the local paper induatry due to the influx of importe cauced by the tariff reduction in 1981. The industry's already low capacity utilization declined further from 59\% in 1981 to $56 \%$ in 1982.

The polioles which have affected the industry eince 1946 were:
a. R.A. No. 35 of 1946 which entitled paper manufacture considered then as a new and necesbary industry, to full exemption from the payment of internal revenue taxes for a period of 5 years. This was revised in 1953 by R.A. No. 901 which granted full exemption to paper manufacture from the payment of import duties, compensating tax, special import tax, and foreign exchange tax;
b. Tarlff Act of 1957 increased the tariff rates on pulp imports from zero duty in 1909 to $10 \%$ in 1957 and on finished product imports from $10 \%-40 \%$ in 1909 to $5 \%-100 \%$ in 1957;
c. Central Bank (CB) Ciroulare and Memoranda required prior CB approval for the importation of 55 paper products under the Unclassified Consuner Goode (UC), Semi-unclassified Coneumer Goode (SUC), and Non-essential Consumer Goode (NEC) categoriee (1970): prior authorization and liceneing from the CB for the importation of neweprint (1972), and that paper warte may be imported only by paper milile/manufacturere (1978);
d. R.A. No. 37 (Revised Tariff and Customs Code of the Philifpines ae amended by P.D. 34 (Jan. 1, 1972) - imposed a three-level tariff rate at 30 , 50 , and $100 \%$ on paper and paperboard products bseed on eseentlality and availability of local production. It also imposed $50 \%$ levy on pulp other than long-fibered which had a tariff of $20 \%$;
e. In 1978 and 1979 advance payment of duties and taxes on all importe which included paper products and inputs, and in 1979 advance margin deposits on import licensee were required;
f. In 1981 and 1982, the CB liberalized the importation of paper producte but during the same year and in succeeding years, it required prior BOI approval/clearance on the importation of
paper products as well as inpute of the industry including machineries and equipment. Then in 1.984, the CB banned importation of commodities requiring prior CB approval and are classified under the UC and NEC categories: The three banned paper producte were bond paper in rolls or sheets; paperboard, ruled, lined, or squared, in rolls or sheete; and oigarette paper, cut to size, in leaves, booklets or tubes.
g. P.D. 1789 (Omnibus Investmente Code of 1981, amended by BP Blg. 391 known as the Investment Incentive Folioy Act of 1983) - provided incentives euch as tax oredite and exemptions, protection of patente and righte, poet-operative tariff, protection from government competition, and priority on financial and investment aesietance and export promotion to pulp, paper, and paperboard mille regietered with the BOI and in preferred areas of investmente in the Investment. Priorities Plan. For pulp and paper, these areas include pulp from indigenous raw materiale; integrated pulp and paper production, fiberboard for indigenous raw materials, and packing containere for export requiremente.
h. Tariff and Custome Code of the Philippines (1982) - scheduled tariff rate adjuetments in 5 stagee over the period 1981-1985. Before this tariff reform program, tariff ratee ranged from $10-50 \%$ for material inpute and $30-100 \%$ for finished producte of the paper industry. In 1985, the tarlff ratee were reduced to $10-20 \%$ for inpute and $10-50 \%$ for finished products.

### 3.4.4. International Trade in Paper and Paper Products

In the Foreign Trade Statietice, paper imports were oatagorized into Paper and Faperboard importe; and paper and paperboard cut to size or shape and articles of paper and paper-board. Reopectively, the categoriee correepond to the froceseing of pulp. into paper and paperboard and the conversion of paper and paperboard into varlous producte. The latter comprized a very emall percentage of all paper importe.

During the years 1975 to 1978 ; there were lower imports compared to 1974 and 1973. The higher cost of ofl which had a greater share of import expenditures and the inflation worldwide which made imports more costly led to lower importe of other goods including paper and paper producta.

The quantity of paper imports roee by 5.3\% from 123921 metric tone in 1980 to 149892 in 1984. In terme of value, the relative proportion to total importe was $0.98 \%$ in 1980 and $1.2 \%$ in 1984.

Paper exporta include newsprint, printing and writing paper, paperboard, toilet paper, paper bage and boxes, envelopes, and etationaries and represent only a small percentage of local output

### 3.4.5. Problems of the Industry

Pineda (1987) enumerates the following problems faced by the paper industry:
a. Financial difficulties apparently due to inflation and pesu devaluation
b. Plant facility which were old and obsolete. In addition, emall pulp and paper mills proliferated in various parts of the country causing low productivity and uncompetitive scale of operation.
c. Unfalr product competition - because of dumping or technical emuggling and foredgn-made paper and paper producte the quality of which are at par or better than locally made producte.
d. Raw material ehortage ie a perennial problem of the industry. The induetry depends on imported raw materiale making it vulnerable to external conditione. For inetance, devaluation reeulted in an increase in the cost of inputs while output prices did not rise as much because of depreebed demand. These problems which started in the 1970 es due to oll price increase and worldwide inflation exacerbated further in the 1980s because of another world recession.
e. Pollution problem - the paper induetry ranked second among industries polluting water bodies.
f. Manpower pooblems - technically trained manpower was lacking both for maintaining the industry'E facilitiee and equipment and producing quality paper and paper producta. Likewlee pulp and paper reeearch lack manpower.

### 3.5. The Fertilizer Industry

Fertilizer is a significant input in crop production in the Philippines, especially rice and sugar. Food crop production has failed to keep pace with the increasing population, hence, one of the reforme made by the governiment was to dismantle the bias against agriculture including fertilizer monopoliee and direct government intervention in the trading of agricultural inpute in 1986. Importation of fertilizers wae liberalized, bringing about the entry of new importers, dietributors, dealers and retailere as well as suppliers (Villareal, 1989).

The number of importere granted licenses by the FPA went up from only 14 in 1985 to 71 in 1986. The entry of new importers brought more competition among. importers and fertilizer traders. This, together with deciining prices in the world market caused a decrease in domestic prices. For instance, while in 1983-1985, importere of urea obtained an average margin of US\$112.7/ton, in 1986-1988, the average margin went down to US\$35.1/ton, a reduction of about $70 \%$.

In order to keep their selling prices competitive, fertilizer companies were compelled to reduce coste of operation by minimizing or discontinuing services provided to farmers. These services included advisory and extension services. Moreover, the distribution network of regional offices with four or five warehouses in each region was reduced. Currently, some fertilizer companies maintain their warehouses, only at or near regional ports.

As the gap between import costs and prices paid by farmers narrowed down, demand for imported fertilizere increased. The rise in the use of fertilizers was also attributed to the protection accorded to locally manufactured phosphatic-based fertilizers.

Other reforms in the fertilizer gector were:
a. Fertilizers are exempted from the $10 \%$ value added tax and from the $9 \%$ ad valorem tax on importation.

The industry is also provided an indirect eubeidy through exemption of imports of nitrogen and potassic-based fertilizers from the $5 \%$ import tax.
b. On transport, there was deregulation of shipping and cargo handling servicee, rationalization of freight rates, provision of incentivee for vessel acquibition and removal of disincentives to the develoment of private port facilities.

### 3.5.1. Role of the FPA

Because of the liberalization program, the Fertilizer and Pesticide Authority (FPA) relinquished its control on the procurement and trading of fertilizers. It retained, however, its other functions such as:
a. Quality control services to safeguard the health of the people and to ensure optimum productivity:
b. Implementing preventive meazures against manipulation in the markets for staples and agricultural inputs - The government monitors, arreste, and prosecutes manipulators as well as regulates fertilizer and pesticide traders through the iesuance of import permits. The permite enable the FPA to monitor the entry and quality of fertilizer shipments and its distribution around the country. Permit ie likewise required from importere in avalling the fertilizer subsidy under a deferred tax payment scheme. The FPA also monitore fertilizer prices to protect farmere.

The deregulation of the fertilizer indugtry, however, has made it more difficult to track down unecrupuloue tradere who eell mielabelled, adulterated or underweight fertilizere because of the preeence of numerous fertilizer handere operating on a non-exclusive arrangement (FADINAP, 1892).

The FPA was oreated in May 1977 through Preeidential Decree 1144 which aleo aboliehed the Fextilizer Industry Authority (FIA). P.D. 1144 placed the regulatory functione applicable to the fertilizer and pesticide induetry on the FPA. It also provided additional powere to the FPA, such ae the licensing of all handlers of fertilizers and registration of all grades and types of fertilizers.

## 3.B.2. Domeetio Produation of Fertilizer.

As early as the 1950s, fertilizers were locally produced with the establishment of the Maria Cristina Fertilizer Corporation (MCFC) in Lanao to booet sugar production in Mindanao. Between 1953 to 1965, rice and corn farmers were encouraged to apply fertilizer in their farme, hence the establishment of,three more plante, namely: Plantere Producte, Inc. (PPI), Atlae Fertilizer Corporation (AFC), and Chemical Industriee of the Philippines (ChemPhil).

The fertilizer plants were strategically located to gatiefy demand. PPI, the largest company, built its plant in Limay, Bataan to provide urea, NP, and NPK in Luzon. It produced more than $50 \%$ of locally produced fertilizer. Chemphil in Taguig, Rizal manufactured ammosul and sulphuric acid for Luzon also. To meet the fertilizer requirements in the Vieayas, AFC built its glant in Toledo, Cebu.

In 1977, increased production coste due to high costs of imported raw materiale forced MCFC and Chemphil to shut down their plante. In 1980, AFC temporarily stopped manufacturing ammonium sulfate but reaumed operations in 1985. In 1982, FFI reduced 1 te volume of production by half and eventually stopped producing fertilizer in 1984.

In 1984, fertilizer prices soared due partly to the globel oil cribie and to the bcarcity of foreign exchange in the Philippinee caused by political inetability. Production of fertilizer declined to a record low of 103364 tons in 1984 from 164,183 tone in 1983.

In 1985, the Philippine Phosphate Fertilizer Corporation (PHILPHOS), a gemi-government owned fertilizer plant, started commercial operations. It wae coneidered the largest phosphate fertilizer plant in Aeia and one of the . largest in the world (it exports 16-20-0 and 18-46-0). It produces 88-90\% of phosphatic-based and complete fertilizers while AFC satisfies $10-12 \%$ of local demand for those fertilizer types. Another private company, the Farmix Fertilizer Corporation (FARMIX) likewise produces phosphatic-based fertilizers.

In 1986, a local plant, International Chemical Inc. (Inchem), started producing commercial potassium sulfate ( $0-$ $0-52$ ) in reeponse to the growing clemand for a chlorine free source of $K O$ for tobacco and other plantation crope.

Table 3.4 enumerates the physical facilities and capabilities of fertilizer manufacturers in 1990. The volume of fertilizer manufactured locally reached 934,346 tons in 1990, an increase of $14.7 \%$ from the total of 814,420 tons in 1989 (Table 3.5). Compared to the Froduction of 103364 tons in 1984, the increase was about $802 \%$ in 1990.

Table 3.6 presents production and demand for fertilizer for the yeare 1985, 1989 , and 1990. In terme of nutriente, demand was always highest for introgen ( $N$ ), followed by phosphorue ( $\mathrm{F} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ ), and then potassium ( K 0 ). 25 2
Production on the other hand, was highest for phosphorub, followed by nitrogen, and then potaeslum.

Of the 2.36 million tons of fertilizer available in 1990, $61 \%$ was absorbed locally, $19 \%$ wae exported, and the reet remained at the importere or dietributore warehouses. In terme of nutrient content, 990551 nutrient tons of total nitrogen, phoephoroue, and potaesium were available during the eame year. Of this volume, nitrogen comprieed $60 \%$, phosphorus, $24 \%$, and potaesium, $16 \%$. About 588,091 nutrient tons were locally coneumed, 194,600 tons were exported, 112980 tons were in the inventory, and 95,217 tons were the adjustmente on seles or imports that were still in transit, at the time the reporte of fertilizer companies to FPA were being prepared.

### 3.5.3 Importation

Fertilizer raw materials and finished producte are both locally produced and imported. Fhosphatic fertilizer is produced locally whereas nitrogenoue and potabeic onee are sourced through imports.

The Philippines.has alwaye relied on importe for its finished grade of nitrogenous and potaesic fertilizers and for the raw materiale necessary for the local manufacture of phoephatic baeed fertilizere. Indonesia, Japan, the former UFSR, the Republic of Korea, Qatar and Canada are among the country $e$ major suppliere of finiehed fertilizere. Indonesia suppliee more than $60 \%$ of the country'e requiremente for urea while Japan euppliee moet of the ammoeul requiremente and the former USSR was the eource of muriate of potaeh (MOF).

Japan and Canada gave fertilizer assistance to the Philippines through the R.P. Japan Grant and CIDA,

Table 3.4. Phybical facilities and capabilities of fertilizer manufacturers, 1990.


HTPH - Hetric Tons yer hour
MTPD - Ketric Tons Per Day
hTPY - Hetric Tons Per Year

Table 3.5. Fertilizer Production by Grade, 1989-1990 (Tone).

| Grade | 1990 | 1989 | Per cent change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16-20-0 | 332953 | 330604 | 0.71 |
| 18-46-0 | 142814 | 76942 | -19.29 |
| 0-18-0 | 106 | 7322 | -98.55 |
| 15-15-15 M ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 84863 | 78941 | 7.50 |
| b |  |  |  |
| 15-15-15 5 | 80698 | 30839 | 161.68 |
| 12-12-12 | 1167 | 2795 | -58.25 |
| 16-16-8 M | 80916 |  |  |
| 14-14-14 | $205814{ }^{\text { }}$ | . 182820 | 12.58 |
| 0-0-52 | . 5015 | 4157 | -20.64 |
| Total | 934346 | 814420 | 14.73 |

[^3]Table 3.6. Fertilizer Production, demand and gap, 1985, 1989 and 1 (Nutrient tone)


1990

| Production | 145714 | 199039 | 62869 | 407622 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Demand | 400572 | 104974 | 82545 | 588091 |
| Gap | $(254858)$ | 94065 | $(19676)$ | $(180469)$ |

1989

| Froduction | 126893 | 191029 | 44559 | 362481 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Demand | 375940 | 84101 | 77260 | 537301 |
| Gap | $(249047)$ | 106928 | $(32701)$ | $(174820)$ |

1985

| Froduction | 88924 | 109652 | 5511 | 204087 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Demand | 205364 | 42822 | 35060 | 283246 |
| Gap | $(116440)$ | 66830 | $(29549)$ | $(79159)$ |

Note: Production of nutrients $N$ and $K O$ were derived from the 2
, local manufacturing of compounde of NP (e.g. 18-46-0 and 16-20-0)

Source: FADINAP (1992)

In 1990, Japan provided 1465 $\frac{10}{}$ wons or anuut $60 \%$ of the ammosul imports whereas Canada provided 15750 tons of MOP or about $30 \%$ of the country"s total imports.

Rock phosphate fertilizers are obtained mainly from Senegal, Irrael, Jordan, Nauru, Central Africa, South Africa, and Moroceo, while anhydrous ammonia is imported from Indonesia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and othere. Sulphuric acid is supplied mainly by Japan.

The average import and retall prices of fertilizer from 1983 to 1991 are presented in Table 3.7.

Importation was left in the hande of the private sector. In 1990, a total of 82 importers were registered. Thirty percent of these importers import traditional grades of fertillzer euch as urea, 21-0-0, and 0-0-60.

Considering the volume of importation in 1990, the first 10 companies were: Swire (15.8\%), Farmix (15.5\%), Fertiphil (12.1) \%, Norsk Hydro (8.4\%), Philippine Planters Corporation (7.2\%), PHILPHOS (7.2\%), AFC (6.9\%), La Filipina ( $6.3 \%$ ), Parafert (2.7\%), and Modern Times (2.8\%).

### 3.5.4. Fertilizer Consumption

In 1990, fertilizer coneumption was placed at 1.4 million tons. For the period 1985 to 1990, consumption grew at a rate of $15.3 \%$ per annum. On the basis of nutrient consumption, NFK consumed amounted to 580,318 nutrient tons In 1990, an increase of $8 \%$ from 1989. Due to increasing use of fertilizer, average application of fertilizer reached 44.9 kgb . NPK/ha.

### 3.5.5. Marketing and Distribution

Each of PHILPHOS, AFC, and FARMIX has exwanisned its own marketing sybtem and a beparate marketing subsidiary. Thelr own dealer networke recelve stocks through their corporate distributors which in turn sell fertilizer to farmers or subretallere.

Imported fertilizers are sold through various dealer networks which receive suppliee either directly from the

Table 3.7. Average import and retall prices of fertllizers by grade, 1883-1991 (05\$/ton).


[^4]NI - Ho importe
Source: Fabinap, 1992
importers upon arrival or through distributors at key distribution points. Private distribution of imported as well as locally manufactured fertilizere are allowed. This is in line with the privatization of the fertilizer sector in order to allow farmers to take full advantage of the available distribution ayetems. Other dietribution channele for fertilizer are farmere cooperatives, sugar mills, cotton growers, and large farms and plantations.

In 1990, about 1.45 million tons of fertilizer were sold in the country with $53 \%$ distributed in Luzon; $25 \%$, in the Visayas; and $23 \%$ in Mindanao. Prior to fertilizer liberalization, the government designated fertilizer ports for discharge. With the program, a free market system exists and this is neceebary to ensure availability of fertilizer in the provinces.

Marketing costs incurred by local manufacturers include transport, handing and etorage coste from the plant to corporate warehousee and eventually to dealers. warehouees/Btores.

The cost etructure for imported fertilizers is more complex. From the port to the warehouse of the importers, coste cover bagging, landing, dellvery and warehoueing and this le eetimated to be about $14 \%$ of total cost. Other coets that should be considered are oost of money and bank charges (about 6\%). Depending on the performance of the company, the relative proportion of administrative overhead and marketing coste vary. Five percent for operating coste and another five percent for their marging are considered reabonable figures by the fertilizer eseociation. Only one percent contingency is given for loeses in storage or transit, ehrinkage and demurrage.

Of the total landed cost, marketing cost amounts to an average of $20 \%, 9.5 \%$ of which is cost of bagging including cost of bag (It ehould be etreesed that about 20\% of the total imports are already bagged). On the average, bagging cost is higher in Manila ports by $p 60 /$ ton compared to other ports in the country. This can be attributed to higher labor cost and higher traneport and storage coets in Manila. Also, there is a lighterage charge of about p80/ton where offehore unloading le neceesary.

### 3.5.6. Fertilizer Subaidy

In 1973, the tax incentive on fertilizer was first granted in the form of an outright tax exemption on fertilizer importation. It was later converted into subsidy and was implemented through the deferred payment scheme. This incentive was given is response to the fourfold increabe in the world fertilizer price and to complement the program of the govermment to attain aelf-eufficienoy in rice and corn by making available cheap. fertilizer to the farmere.

The subsidy started as a cash subsidy echeme based on a two-tiered pricing byetem wherein fertilizere were sold to growers of pxiority $I$ crope euch as rice, comn and vegetables at a eubsidized price which was 50 to $70 \%$ off the regular price. Fertilizers were sold at a higher prioe to growers of priority II orope or export orope euch as bugar, banana, and pineapple. However, there was rampant diversion of fertilizex from priority $I$ orope to priority II orope. The program was terminated in 1976 because of difficulty in implementation and monitoring and the large budgetary requirement amounting to $\$ 12$ billion.

Simultaneoue with the two-tiered pricing system, . the FPA developed a prioing formula in order that local manufacturers can recover their production cost with a guarenteed marls-up of $5 \%$ and importere can be absured of a $2 \%$ mark-up. To do thie, the FPA determined the ex-warehouee price based on the emount of cash eubsidies available to the fertilizer companies as well as on the welghted average coet of locally produced and imported fextilizer. For the prices to prevail in the market, FPA ruled that no importer can bring 'in fertilizer without the approval of FPA. Thie eyetem was aboliahed in 1982 due to the slunp in the world market prices ae well as budgetaxy conetraints on the part of the government.

The government'then adopted the indirect subsidy to the local fertilizer scheme which was: implemented under the deferred tax payment scheme. Hence, the government through the FPA absorbe the applicable cubtome duties and taxes. The import duties were charged againet the subsidy fund of the government known as the Tax Expenditure Fund (TEF) in the General Appropriations Act.

Fertilizers not available locally were granted full exemption from the $20 \%$ import duty. Importere of phosphatic fertilizer are taxed to protect the local manufacturere. In

1988, however, importere of phosphatic fertilizer paid only $5 \%$ import tax as the balance of $15 \%$ was subsidized.

Executive Order No. 364 in July 1989 lowered import tariff on fertilizer gradee from $20 \%$ to $5 \%$. The subsidy on nitrogen and potaseic based fertilizer imports continued while that on phosphates was terminated.

Starting in December 1990, the government assumed the 9\%. Ad Valorem Tax imposed on fertilizer importis, in addition to the $5 \%$ import tax. The Ad Valorem Tax which was levied on all importe was reduced to $5 \%$ in January 1991. In July 1991, Executive Order No. 470 lowered the 1mport duty of nitrogen-based and potassic-based fertilizer from five percent to zero percent.

Again, to help farmers increase their income through increaced productivity, the government implemented the Rice Action Program (RAP) in 1988. There were also the Rice Production Enhancement Frogram (RPEP) I and RPEP II which provided a free bag of urea for every two bag of mineval fertilizer with a maximum of three bage free for every 818 bags purchased. Where farmer beneficiaries opted for inorganic fertilizere, they are entitled to one bag free for every four bage purchased or a maximum of three bage free for every 12 bage bought. While RPEP I and II covered irrigated areas only, the RAP covered both irrigated and rainfed areas.

### 3.5.7. Problems of the Industry

Among the problems of the industry were inadequate capacity and low efficiency in production; inadequate supply of raw materials for local manufacturing of fertilizer; inferior quality and insufficient characterization of locally available raw materials deter local manufacturers from using them; shortage of vesses in transhipment of fertilizers; lack of adequate pier facilities and warehousing capacities, shortage of credit schemes; ineffective government extension services which should have been the appropriate source of information on the efficient use of fertilizer; and the high urea-rice price ratio which affects the use of fertilizer by farmere (FADINAP, 1992).

### 3.6. The Peaticide Industry

Pesticides have become a major component of farm production, being used as an input in the production of rice, vegetable, fruits, and others. The government agency that has been given the power to regulate the importation, production, distribution, sale and use of pestioides in the Fertilizer and Peetiolde Authority (FFA).

### 3.6.1. Market Structure of the Pesticide Industry

The pesticide industry is characterized by a small number of sellers, lack of marketing information among firme, some degree of product differentiation and existence of barriers to entry (Rola and Chupungco, 1992). The structure of the industry has remained oligopolistic most probably ever since the induetry started. Barriers to entry in the industry include among others the amount of oapitalization needed and the liceneing requirements (Rola and Chupungco, 1992; Rola, 1981).

In 1980, the Agricultural Pesticide Institute of the. Philippines (APIP), a non-stock, non-profit organization of companies engaged in the manufacture/formulation and/or marketing of agricultural chemicals controlled about 90 percent of the total sales of the Induetry (Rola, 1981). Ae of 1991, the member companies of AFIP have held the control of the industry to the same extent. The APIP was founded in 1967 and was then composed of 22 pesticide companies. Only one pesticide company, the Plantere Products, Inc. was not a member of APIP in 1991.

Pesticide companies differ in businese operations. Some companiee import pesticide producte and market the finel producte by themeelves. Others import the technical materials, formulate these materials into final producte which are then marketed to the ueere.

AFIP (1991) reported that 1 te members employ a total of 424 sales representatives and extension agents/demonstratore all over the country, and have around 3000 dealere duly licensed by the FPA. For calendar year 1991, 118 dealers registered with FPA for pesticides only and 1062 for fertilizer and peeticidee. Among the regions, Region IV or Southern Tagalog had the most number of pesticides dealere, 23, while Region III or Central Luzon had the most number of
fertilizer and pesticide dealers, 195, who were iseued license to operate in 1991. These figures were lower than the number registered in 1990. The FPA license 1s effective for a continuous three-year business operation, thue considering the yeare 1989 to 1991 , the total number of registered dealers adds up to 4186.

The sales statietice of the APIP for the second half of the 1980 s show that the stock eales of agricultural chemicals generally increasing.

Importe consisted of insecticides, fungicides, and herbicides. In terms of value, the highest. anount of importe was reported for ineecticides, followed by fungicides, and then herbicides. In 1989, the total value of pesticide imports was $\$ 49.2$ million composed of 41 percent insecticides, 23 percent fungicides, and, 14 percent herbicides. In terms of volume, the highest was obtained in 1987 for insecticides at 3007 mt and for fungicides at. 5571 mt . Herbicide imports was highest in 1988 at 2043 mt . In 1889, the total volume of peaticide importation amounted to 12265 mt consisting of 20 percent ineecticidee, 14 percent herbicides, and 16 percent fungioides.

Prior to 1973, the tariff rate on formulated peaticides was 10 percent. From January 1, 1973 until Auguet 23, 1991, it became 20 percent under P.D. 34 and P.D. 1464 but was back to 10 percent on August 24, 1991 under E.O. No. 470.

### 3.6.2 Marketing of Pesticides by Dealers/Wholesalers

Based on the interviews with 34 pesticide dealers and wholesalers. In nine provinces in the Philippines, the most common type of marketing channel for pesticides was the channel from the pesticide company/distributor to the dealer and finally to the farmers. The other channels observed were from the pesticide company/dietributor to the big dealer and then to the emall dealer and lastly to the farmere (Rola and Chupungeo, 1992). Rola (1981) did a more comprehensive study of the marketing intermediaries and identified other marketing channels for pesticides such as from the indentor direct to distributors and plantation owners, and from the dietributors to big dealers to agents and then to farmers.

To increase bales, the pesticide dealers and wholesalers gave discounts on their producte, personal
service thru technical advice, and oredit extension, among others. Most of these dealers and wholesalers determined their aelling price based on mark-up while others used the prevailing market price or the suggested company price. The mark-up on the procurement price of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other chemicals varied from one percent to 33 percent with moet of the mark-up ranging from 6 to 10 percent.

Although the government banned the sale of some pesticides, some market outlets were found to continue selling these banned peeticidee. In its pesticide regulatory policies and implementing suidelines and procedures, and its latest listing of banned and restricted pesticides, FPA (1987-1991) only allowed the use of DDT for malarial eradication program. Aguatin and Brestan, on the other hand, were formerly allowed for use in the control of golden snails, but then were found to be toxic and proved hazardous to humane and other living organisme and hence were banned in the market through Pesticide Circular No. 1, Serlee of 1990 (FPA, 1991).

### 3.7. The Petroleum Industr

### 3.7.1. Institutions

'the falilppine oll inaustry is governea $b y$ the Petroleum Act of 1949 which regulatee oil explovation and production including refining and oil pipelines. The marketing function of the industry is contained in the Retail Trade Nationalization Act of 1954 which originally banned non-Filipino corporations starting 1964 from selling 011 directiy to end-ueers. This granted American firms a 10-year extension when the RP-US Parity Agreement expired. Corporations were likewise encouraged to organize 100 percent Filipino-owned companies to do retail activities.

In May 1975. P.D. No. 714 amended the law and permitted manufacturers or processore or their subsidiary or affiliate company to sell to industrial, commercial or agricultural users and consumers who utilize the products to render public service and/or to produce or manufacture producte which are in turn eold by them.

In 1971, the 011 Induetry Commiseion (OIC) was created to regulate and eet pricee of petroleum producte. It wee gradually phased out with the organization of the Ministry of Energy in 1977 through P.D. 1206 and the activation of the Board of Energy (BOE) under the Office of the Freeldent. The BOE handled the price regulatory functions of the OIC. The other functions of the BOE were:
a. Ibsuance, renewal, and cancellation of power franchises.
b. Licensing and regulation of petroleum refinery capacities.
c. Review of crude oll import costs in order that extraordinary gains to ofl companies due to product price adjustmente would redound to the public interest.

The Ministry of Energy was created to formulate, implement, and monitor policies and programs of the energy sector. In 1986, it was renamed the Office of Energy Affairs and was placed under the administrative supervision of the Office of the Fresident through E.O. No. 20.

The Offlce of Energy Affalrs became the agenoy responeible in the formulation, planning, monitoring, implementing, and coordinating policies and programe in energy. In addition, it coordinatee all activities which the govermment may need to undertake in relation to the exploration, development, marketing, distribution, storage, and efficient utilization of energy reeources from foesil fuels euch ae petroleum, coal, natural gas and gas liquids, nuclear-fuel reeourcee, geothermal reeources, hydroelectric resourcee, and exieting and potential forms of nonconventional energy.

On May. 8, 1987, E.O. No. 172 created the Energy Regulatory Board (ERB) In place of the BOE. It also absorbed the Bureau of Energy Utilization's regulatory . and adjudication powere and functione.

The Office of Energy Affairs also took over the Philippine National Oil Company'B (PNOC) regulatory authorlty over oil companiee particularly on product importatione. The FNOC, created in 1973 by Presidential Decree 334 , however, remained a state corporation which undertook. ofl/petroleum operations, mainly the buying of crude oil for Petron Corporation, its refinery and marketing subsidiary.

In December 1973, PNOC acquired the marketing operations of Esso and the latter's 57 percent equity in Bataan Refining Corporation (later increased to 60 fercent). Esso wae renamed Petrophil Corporation which was later merged with the Bataan Refining Corporation to form Petron Corporation in 1987. Earlier, on September 1, 1883, Mobil, which had a market share of 12.6 percent, sold their marketing assets to Caltex but PNOC, acquired the 40 percent share of Mobil in•BRC.on an extended payment proceesing agreement.

### 3.7.2. The Medium Term Energy Plan

The Philippine Medium-Term Energy Plan 1988-1992 defined the energy objectives of the country as follows:
(1) on the supply side, to ensure the avallability of energy to the local markets at reasonable prices,
(2) on the demand side, to promote the judicious and efficient use of energy resources; and
(3) on the envirommental side, to accomplish (1) and (2) with minimal adverse effects on the environment

To achieve these objectives, then President Aquino created the Energy Coordinating Council (ECC) through E.O. No. 338 in September 1988 with the following powers and functions:
(1) Review and formally ratify. the energy plan, including the power expansion program of government agencies and corporations;
(2) Make appropriate representation to the Investment Coordinating Committee or the government agency responeible for investment fund appropriatione, to eneure that energy sector investments are consistent with the approved energy plan;
(3) Analyze, coordinate, and, with the approval of the Fresident, initiate major energy and power development projects that require the utilization of funde available to the government;
(4) Coordinate the implementation of approved projecte to assist in, their timely completion; and
(5) As the need arises, such as during anticipated energy or fower shortage, determine and recommend to the President the appropriate course of action.

### 3.7.3. Pricing Polioy

The government set key product specifications for fuels and enforce price ceilinge which were adjusted from time to time.

Adjustmente on company take are ueually delayed but were allowed for almost full recovery of increases in crude coet and other cost factors such as refining, marketing, and financing. Priees ex-Refinery and ex-Pandacan (the main Manila oil terminala) were firet determined. Differentials were then added on fox other point's in the marketing chain to reflect freighting coete (PSPC; no date).

A large percentage of wholesale and pump prices was taxes for various purposes. Such taxes were set at different levele for specific products to facilitate the socialized pricing policies of the government. Selling pricee for gasoline and aviation fuel were made higher than those for keroeene (used by the masses), gaboll (used for maes transport), and fuel ofl (used for industry and power generation).

The Consumer Price Equalization Fund (CPEF), formerly Consumer Cost Equalization Fund, later was made a component of the product price build-up due to widened price differentiale between crudes of OPEC hardlinere and conservatives (who obtained their crude at much higher prices) to recover crude coste and other cost variablee beyond a defined reference price. This was also intended to eliminate the potential windfall gaine for the advantaged oll companies and to equalize the crude cost burden without affecting the uniform industry prioing polloy of the government.

Because of the July 1981 decision of the BOE.to allow recoveries for the increase in the peso coet due to the deterioration of the forelgn exchange rate, the CPEF latex became a multi-purpose fund. On June 21, 1983, thie mechanism was abolished. Oll companies were allowed to retain the average amount being collected and paid to the fund.

The Oil Price Stabilization Fund (OPSF) was established on October 10, 1984 to serve as a buffer against crude oil prices and fluctuation in the exchange rate (PSPC, no date). If actual coste of importation is greater than the reference crude price and the peac-dollar exchange rate bet by the ERB, the three oll companies can reimburse the peso cost differential. from the OPSF. If it is lower, the oil companies deposit the resulting peso cost differential into the OPSF.

An added feature of the OPSF was the forward forelgn exchange cover which allowed the oll companies to recover from the OPSF financing costs for importations of crude ofl (Lamberte and Yap, 1991). Such coete represent the difference between the forelgn exchange rate at the time of availment of trade credit and at the time of settlement or repayment of such oredit. The forward forelgn exchange cover extended for 360 days but was reduced to 180 days beginning September 1990. The OPSF chargee a flat rate of two percent as riek fee for a maximum period of 180 days of cover.

The OPSF formerly extended oil price subsidy to the National Fower Corporation (NFC) on a per liter baele. The arrangement was that oll companiee have to sell fuel oll to the NPC at subbidized rate but higher prices for other petroleum products would be charged to recoup the eubeidy. This soheme was aleo being done in subeidizing petroleum products such ae kerosene, dieeel, and liquified petroleum gas (LPG). The NPC eubsidy has been abollshed since January, 1991.

For sometime, the OPSF was a self-liquidating buffer mechaniem. Then, the government oreated the Petroleum Price Stabilization Fund. The OPSF was virtually converted into a subsidy mechaniem when Congress appropriated p5 bilion in 1990 to partly pay the accrued OPSF arrears.

As of 1991 , the structure of the retail prices. Ior petroleum products wás composed of direct company take, specific tax, contribution to OPSF, the hauling price, and the dealer's margin.

There was a plan to deregulate the oll industry, that 1. ehift to the market-based oil pricing syetem. On January 1, 1991, some aspecte of the deregulation such as the removal of the NPC subeldy were carried out (Lamberte and Yap, 1991). The measures taken were:
a. Discontinuance, effective 1 July 1990, of the
foreign exchange forward cover provided to oil companies.
b. Elimination of the power rates eubsidy through the OPGF.
e. Shifting from ad valorem tax on oll to specific tax.
d. Allowing more competition in zome aepects of the oil induetry, euch as traneport; importation of oll producte, etc.
e. Allowing the PNOC to expand its dietribution and refinery capacity and accelerating ite development of geothermal energy sources:

Bedaue of the eharp riee in the crude od price caued by the Iraq-Kuwait conflict in 1989 to 1990; the government poetponed the planned deregulation of the oll induatry. Hence, there were atill the OPSF and the foreign exchange cover.

In epite of the increase in world prices of crude oll and the deteriorating value of the peso, the government tried to hold on to the existing domestic prices of petroleum producte for almoet two monthe elnce the gtart of the Gulf War Crisis. Hence, more deficits were built up in the OPSF. The unpald claims of the three oll companies reached $p 7.2$ billion as of December 1989 , increasing by another 73.5 billion in the first half of 1990.

On September 21, 1990, the ERB adJusted the prices of petroleum products by an average of $\$ 1.42$ per ilter. On December 5, 1991, another increase by an average of 12.82 per liter made. In this latter increase, the price of premium gasoline went up by 80 percent to $\$ 15.95$ per liter. The. LPG price roee to 76.89 per liter, an increabe by 57 percent. A few days after the price adjuetment, strong pressure from various groups to give some relief to ueers of diesel oil, kerosene, and LPG made the ERB lower the retail prices of thees producte. The price of fuel ofl was likewise adjueted downward.

In Auguet 1991, about six monthe after the softening of the world pricee of crude oil, the prices of petroleum products were lowered by an average of $\$ 1.17$ per liter.

In September 1990, the ad valorem tax on oil products was converted into specific tax (Table 3.8). This measure

Table 3.8. Taxes and Luties on Petroleum Froducts:

|  | Existing <br> Ad Valorem | New Specific | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Product | PesorLiter | Peso/Liter | Reduction |
|  | Tax Rate | Tax Rate | in Tax |


| Premium | 3.5963 | 2.5200 | 30 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Regular | 3.2622 | 2.2800 | 30 |
| Jet | 3.4037 | 2.3800 | 30 |
| Diesel | 1.1532 | 0.4500 | 60 |
| Kerosene | 1.1704 | 0.5000 | 57 |
| LPG | 1.0590 | 0.0000 | - |
| Asphalt | 0.7966 | 0.5600 | 21 |
| Thinner | 1.1780 | 0.0000 | - |
| Fuel Oj | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | - |
| Total | 1.1363 | 0.6195 | - |
|  |  | 0.4271 |  |
| Duty | 1.5634 | 1.0466 | - |
| Total |  |  | - |


Source: Lamberte and Yap (1991). Original data from the Office of Energy Affairs:
reduced the effective tax rate on petroleum products and at the same time made the excise tax on petroleum products lese vouyant.

O1l companies were urged by the government to maintain crude/product stock cover of 90 daye for eecurity in supply. In cases of cribes such as the Gulf War crisis, this was somehow relaxed. The Office of Energy Affairs, however, closely monitored the etocke.

### 3.7.4. The Oil Companies

There are three big oil companies in the Philippines, namely: Pilipinas Shell petroleum Corporation (PSPC), Fetron Corporation and Caltex (Fhilippines) Inc. Theee oil companies compete intencely for the domestic oil market. Their operations including pricing, however, are regulated by the govermment.

Most of the government's oil requiremente are supplied by Petron/PNOC. Ae of 1988, it wae number one in the 011 industry with Total Oil Inland Trade (TOIT) market share of 37.3 percent (FSFC, no date). (TOIT is composed of reseller, induetrial consumer, Philippine government, U.S. military bases and international sales volume.

The Caltex refinery located in Bauan, Batangas and produces 72,000 barrels per day has enough tankage and jetty facilitiee to recelve crude ex-VLCCe. According to the PSPC report (1991) Caltex has the distinct advantage of eupplying oil to Metro Manila most economically through the FPIC white and black oll plpelinee.

Prior to Petrophil daye, Caltex was the induetry leader with a 35 percent market shave. When Petrophil wae eetablished, the market share of Caltex was reduced to 24 percent. But with ite acquisition of the: Mobil marketing network in 1983, ite market ehare went up to 33.5 percent by the end of 1984. Caltex wae eald to enjoy the lowest frelght for orude and the higheet public brand awareness (PSPC, 1991). By the end of 1988, 1te ehare of the market wae 32.1 percent.

Two-thirds owned by Shell Petroleum Co. Ltd, PSPC with ite refinery located in Tabangao, Batangas, ranked third in the industry in 1988. To strengthen its market position, it acquired Basic Landoil Energy Corporation in July 1982
increasing 1 ts market share from 18.7 percent in 1982 to 21.4 percent in 1983. In 1988, PSPC Bhared 30.1 percent of the total oil market.

A $\$ 667$ million new refinery by PSPC is now being conetructed in Tabangao, Batangae and ie expected to make PSPC the biggest oll firm by 1994 (Lirio, 1993). It would increaee PSPC's daily capacity from 72,000 barrele to 110,000 barrele by 1994. (Petron'e refinery produoee currently about 100,000 barrels a day compared to the 70,000 barrels a day of Caltex). The Royal Dutch Group of Companies, PSPC's parent firm at preeent, would invest p250 million whereas foreign investors would put up $\$ 233$ million.

The new oil refinery was intended to meet rising oil demand and ease the importation of diesel fuel. The PSPC (1993) study underscores that existing refining facilities which average from 30 to 35 yeare old would be unable to meet volume and quanlity requirements by mid-1990s unlees new and additional capacity is built up.

### 3.7.5. Demand

The total energy consumption in the Philippines for the period 1980 to 1991 ranged from 92.07 mfllion barrele of fuel oil equivalent (MBFOE) in 1985 to . 120.59 MBFOE in 1990. Of the total energy coneumption, the share of imported ofl increased from 53.4 percent in 1986 to 63.2 percent in 1990. Of the total import bill, oil import was about 16.6 percent in 1990 (Lamberte and Yap, 1991).

The bulk of the country's crude oil imports come from the Middle East. Total crude oil importe from the Middle East rose from 68.4 percent in 1988 to 75 percent in 1989 and 83 percent in 1990. The ASEAN countries particularly Malaysia and. Brunei supply about 17 to 19 peroent of the Philippine crude oil requirement.

In 1991, the average daily consumption nationwide was only 225,000 barrels. This rose to a high 260,000 barrels in 1992. In 1993, the average consumption of all petroleum products in the Philippines was 264,000 barrels a day (Lirio, 1993). Twenty percent of the daily demand was imported.

### 3.8. The Land Transport Industry

The transportation network in the Philippines is composed of roads, railroads, air routes and shipping routes. The major means of movement, land tranisport shared P20.59 billion (at 1985 prices) or 64.12 percent of the 30.711 billion earned by the transport industry in 1991. This is four percentage points higher than that for 1981 but three percentage points lower than that for 1986.

The country's transport industry began with the ehipment of U.S. abeembled care into the country during the American occupation. Only horee-drawn calebas and the tranvia or railroads could then be seen in the etreets of Manila.

After World War II, there wae a traneport ehortage regulting in the convereion of U.S. Army eurplue vehicles into jeepneys. Using vibrant colors to paint the G.I. jeepe, the bodiee were lengthened to increase the beating capacity. The new jeepneye were powered by surplue jeep enginee such as McArthur, M38 and Willye. In the late 1960s, the diesel engine had taken over paving the way for the importation of reconditioned diesel engines of Japaneese make (Anonymoue, 1984).

### 3.8.1. Jeepneys

About 80 to 85 percent of the jeepney market is supplied by Sarao Motors Corporation and Francisco Motore Corporation. There was stiff competition with big car manufacturere who produced Fierae, Cinnemon, Selkbayane, Tamaraws and Harabae. Jeepneys were, however, preferred because they were lese coetly, epare parte were readily available and they can accomodate more paesengers and goods. The gmaller engines of the jeepneye meant leas gasoline consumption. As fuel coneumption determined to a large extent the profitability of operation the deepneye were fitted with dieeel motore which uee lees fuel (Anonymour, 1984).

### 3.8.2. Car Manufaoturing

As a result of the country's limited foreign exchange, progressive car manufacturing was introduced in 1969. Earlier, there wae a clamor for voluntary reduction on completely knocked down car importa on the part of local car aseemblers of the automotive induetry and the government to employ a progreselve car manufacturing program (PCMP). To progressively increase the domestic content of care and save dollare, the PCMP encouraged domestic manufacture of automotive componente, created manufacturing activity in emall and medium size enterprises for the domestio production of automotive componente, upgrading in the process the engineering and production skille and technological knowhow; and generated new exports in a regional automotive complementation program.

The participants of the PCMP included five companies: Ford Philippinee, Inc.; Delta Motore Corporation; General Motore Philippines. Incorporated; NISSAN; aand Canlubang Automotive Resources. As a promotion strategy, manufacturers offered varioue modele for each brand.

### 3.8.3. Performance of the Motor Vehicle Industry

The total number of regietered motor vehicles increased from 865 thousand in 1975 to 1.12 militon in 1985 and to 1.715 million in 1991 (Table-3.9). Of the total number in 1985, about 88 percent were private vehiclee; 8.09 percent were public utility vehicles; 3.30 percent, government owned aare and other vehiclee; and diplomatic vehiclee, 0.40 percent. The number of private vehicies in 1990 increased by 34 percent, however the ehare to total number of the motor vehicles declined by about elght percentage pointe compared with 1985. The number of private care increased by about 100 thoueand unite but utility vehiclee outstripped private care. The number of utility vehicles increased by almost 200 thousand unite. The number of vehicles-for-hire went up from 90,607 in 1985 to 246,082 in 1990, an increase of 172 percent thus the share of thie group to total number of motor vehicles rose from 8.09 percent to 15.19 percent. In 1991,81 percent of all motor vehicles were privately-owned; 16.34 percent, for hire, 2.61 percent, government vehicles, and 0.76 percent, diplomatic vehicles. Hence, private vehiclee comprized the biggest portion of road traneport, followed by for hire vehiclee,

Table 3.9. Number of Motor Vehicles Registered by Type of Vehicle: 1985, 1990

| Type of vehicle | 1985 |  | 1990 |  | 1991 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number P | Percent. | Humber | Pervent | Number | Percent |
| Tolal motor vehicle | 1120172 | 100.00 | 1620242 | 100.00 | 1715366 | 100.00 |
| Private | 988143 | 88.21 | 1322783 | 81.64 | 1384148 | 80.69 |
| Cars | 332473 | 30.24 | 430735 | 26.58 | 430943 | 25.12 |
| Utility Vehicles | 328179 | 29.30 | 520534 | 32.13 | 560831 | 32.69 |
| Buses | 2804 | 0.25 | 1288 | 0.20 | 3404 | 0.20 |
| Trucks | 79759 | 7.12 | 117047 | 7.22 | 123426 | 7.21 |
| Hutarcycles/Tricycles | 231207 | 13.71 | 233861 | 14.43 | 247892 | 14.45 |
| Trailers | 13121 | 1.22 | 17318 | 1.01 | 17652 | 1,03 |
| For line | 90607 | 8.09 | 246082 | 15.19 | 280254 | 16.34 |
| Cars | 1123 | 0.64 | 13676 | 0.84 | 16360 | 0.95 |
| litility vehicles | 57961 | 5.17 | 71365 | 4.40 | 87285 | 5.09 |
| Duses | 11641 | 1.04 | 14667 | 0.91 | 16884 | 0.98 |
| Trucks | 6362 | 0.51 | 6515 | 0.40 | 7534 | 0.44 |
| MoLorcycles/Tricycles: | 6622 | 0.59 | 138948 | 8.58 | 151091 | 8.81 |
| Trailers : | 898 | 0,08 | 911 | 0.06 | 1100 | 0.06 |
| Government | 36947 | 3.10 | 45482 | 2.81 | 44759 | 2.61 |
| Cars | 5694 | 0.51 | 6052 | 0.31 | 5724 | 0.33 |
| Itility"Velicles | 19690 | 1.76 | 23704 | 1.46 | 22112 | 1.33 |
| Buses | 291 | 0.03 | 386 | 0.02 | - 402 | 0.02 |
| trucks | 6001 | 0.54 | 5607 | 0.35 | 4552 | 0.17 |
| MotorcycleslTricycles | 5161 | 0.46 | 9617 | 0.59 | 11144 | 0.65 |
| Trailers ' | 110 | 0.01 | 116 | 0.01 | 205 | 0.01 |
| Diplomatic | 4475 | 0.40 | 5895 | 0.36 | 6205 | 0.36 |

then government vehicles, and lastly, diplomatio vehicies. The ratio in 1975 was 21 motor vehicles for ever 1000 population. In 1990, there were 27 vehicles for 1000 people.

Comparing the newly regietered motor vehicles and vehicles with renewed registration. Table 3.10 showe that the number of newly regietered vehicles rose from 133 thousand in 1981 to 183 thousand in 1991. It can be obeerved, however, that from 1983 to 1984 (the trend of which continued until 1988), there was a ehare drop in the number of euch vehiclee from 137 thousand in 1983 to 60 thousand in 1984. The number of vehicles with renewed registration went up from 873 thoueand in 1981 to 1.5 million in 1991.

Between Metro Manila and the regione, more vehicles were newly registered in the former but more renewal of registration very made outaide Mero Manila. This may be explained by the fact that more new vehioles are sold in Metro Manila and even buyers from the provinces regieter newly purchased cars in the city but renew them in their respective regions in the succeeding yeare after purchase.

In 1991, a total of 1.2 million motor vehicles used gacoline while 499 thoueand utilized diesel fuel (Table 3.11). The high coet of gaboline compared to that of diesel resulted in the increasing prefexence for diesel-fed utility vehiclee and buees. The share of diesel-fed utility vehiclee to the total number of utility vehicles inoreased from 33 percent in 1981 to 50 percent in 1991; 70 percent in 1981 to 96 percent in 1991 for bueee.

Between Metro MAnila and the regione, the proportion of gae fueled vehiclee varied only by a mall percentage. Gaefueled vehicles in Metro Manila repreeented 72.5 percent of total while in the regione the correeponding proportion $1 e$ 69.4 percent.

### 3.8.4. Rail Traneport

Trains are energy-flexible. They have different typee of power sources: gasoline, diesel, electricity, wood, coal and even seawdust. They can carry more paseengers and freight on a eingle car compared to other vehicles. One coach can accomodate 120 passengere while a bus avarage eecting capacity $1 e$ only 45 pereons. The same train wagon

Table 1.10, Number of Motor Vehicles negistered by Classifjeation, New and Renewal, 1981 to 1991.


| 1981 | 133449 | 872581 | 35645 | 202440 | 35072 | 329634 | 11661 | 91479 | 2270 | 15551 | $4731]$ | 139677 | 1488 | 13800 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1982 | 137192 | 949988 | 33292 | 308757 | 38948 | 346362 | 10336 | 96538 | 1187 | 16171 | 51342 | 167101 | 2087 | 15059 |
| 1983 | 137250 | 1063553 | 31111 | 335891 | 38075 | 389850 | 9746 | 101110 | 1042 | 15672 | 55608 | 205817 | 1668 | 15213 |
| 1984 | 60216 | 1105341 | 12722 | 348900 | 17610 | 399111 | 4759 | 97312 | 133 | 14846 | 23366 | 229967 | 1326 | 16105 |
| 1985 | 41570 | 1078602 | 8589 | 339360 | 11669 | 394161 | 3220 | 90718 | 277 | 14459 | 16965 | 226025 | 850 | 13879 |
| 1986 | 60633 | 1125199 | 7571 | 349117 | 13826 | 402728 | 3413 | 91805 | 309 | 14665 | 34750 | 253875 | 764 | 13009 |
| 1987 | 71000 | 1105753 | 10657 | 348108 | 23144 | 418613 | 5112 | 92640 | 545 | 14628 | 30430 | 219138 | 1112 | 12626 |
| 1988 | 87963 | 1182520 | 16322 | 360324 | 39543 | 441556 | 6438 | 101589 | 573 | 14510 | 29659 | 251243 | 1428 | 13296 |
| 1989 | 141499 | 1289965 | 32808 | 380190 | 50821 | 485584 | 8273 | 110109 | 868 | 16082 | 46599 | 284376 | 2130 | 13624 |
| 1990 | 206090 | 1414152 | 42389 | 412165 | 74731 | 540872 | 13419 | 117554 | 2119 | 1622 | 70034 | 312392 | 3398 | 14947 |


$\begin{array}{lllllllllllllll}\text { Hetro } & 92930 & 628846 & 27371 & 281891 & 32642 & 244891 & 8054 & 37246 & 918 & 5400 & 22419 & 514 J 2 & 1526 & 7986\end{array}$
Manila
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}\text { Dutside } & 89896 & 903694 & 4759 & 142585 & 39327 & 353388 & 4592 & 88246 & 959 & 17895 & 39401 & 296875 & 858 & 8587\end{array}$
Metro
Manila

Source: land Transportation Dffice

Tahle 3.11 Nubber of Notor Vehiedes Regislered Dy Classificalinn, Dy Type of Fuel Need: 1981-1991.


| 1981 | 773049 | 217693108096 | 9989243295 | 12141135584 | 675565365 | 12456180709 | 628115228 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982 | 80.5176 | 264858329752 | 12297233169 | 15214128690 | 781843207 | 14151210358 | 8085.17146 |
| 1983 | 881223 | 322699351296 | 15706230727 | 19719823050 | 878061939 | 14775254211 | 121416881 |
| 1788 | 826305 | 3218213450.55 | 15667216454 | 20026718787 | 832881285 | 13994244728 | 860517431 |
| 1985 | 794.198 | 311021335267 | 12682206341 | 19948919934 | 78950829 | 13907236997 | 599314729 |
| 1981 | 852345 | 319700344197 | 12491211888 | 20466613856 | 813621958 | 13016200446 | 817313773 |
| 1907 | 829850 | 333165346573 | 12192226556 | 21519011719 | 850331478 | 1369524.513 | $6055 \mid 3738$ |
| 1988 | 905061 | 349893364355 | 12291248612 | 22648714899 | 93128197 | 14286277201 | 370114726 |
| 1989 | 1021703 | 394007398593 | 14405 280949 | 25545616111 | 102271800 | 16150 325250 | 572515754 |
| 1970 | 1152705 | 4491124.37079 | 17475123598 | 29200517446 : | 1135211050 | 17291371612 | 8814.18 .145 |
| 1991 | 1197282 | $499127 \$ 36775$ | 19831338177 | 33267115692 | 22446885 | 19805405753 | 137418957 |
| Hat.ro | 516706 | 195558292619 | 16643144818 | 1327155221 | 40779288 | 603073760 | 919512 |
| Monila |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dulside | 680576 | 303569144156 | 3188193359 | 19995610471 | 82367597 | 13775331993 | 4283 9445 |
| Metro |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manila |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Philippige National Railuays and Melen Transit Organization Incorporated.
can carry about 30 tons of freight while a huge trailer truck can load about 10 tons of cargo. Moreover, on the average, a train has 10 wagone which can load about 1600 passengers and 300 tons of commodities. Hence, traine provide the least oostly mode of mase transit (Anonymoue, 1984).

The Philippine railway company was managed by the Americans during the Second World War. Later, with the Japanese occupation, it was renamed by the Japanese "Rikuyo OKarikuko." By virtue of R.A. 4156 paseed on June 30, 1964, the companys name was changed to Philippine NAtional Railways. On August 20, 1971, a new PNR charter was pabeed through R.A. 6366. Its capltal stock was increased from P250 million to 9650 mlli 10 n providing for a rehabilitation and modernization program.

The PNR rendere two typee of eervices, the train service and the motor service. The former has paseenger cars and baggage care, diebel rail cars, dieael engine and hydraulic locomotives and frelght care while the latter consists of revenue vehicle (e.g. tourist and minibusee, freight trucks and tanker for hire) and nonrevenue vehides. Nonrevenue vehiclee are not profit or income earnere euch as ambulances, automobiles, wreckere and othere that are for official uee only.

In Table 3.12 ehowe that the number of paesengers carried by the traine in general declined from 6.2 million in 1950 to 5.4 mililon in 1975 to 0.7 miliion in 1991. Total passengers revenue, however, rose from 6.7 m 11110 n in
 Revenue fer passenger was lowest in 1950 at $\$ 1.09$ was $\$ 5.96$ In 1975 and was highest at 898.39 in 1991.

Like the number of passengers, frelght tone loaded generally declined from 787 thousand in 1950 to 281 thousand in 1975 to 12 thousand in 1991. Although revenue per freight ton increased from 88.65 in 1950 to 833.44 in 1975 to P184 in 1991, freight revenue varled with the higheet at P9. 4 million in 1975 and the lowest at $\$ 2.1$ million in 1991. Likewlee, exprese tons loaded fluctuated ranging from 10 thousand in 1991 to 104 thousand in 1974. With rebenue per express ton increasing from $\$ 38$ in 1950 to 8860 in 1991, express revenue rose from $\$ 1.7 \mathrm{~m} 11110 \mathrm{n}$ in 1950 to PB .0 million in 1975 to 88.6 million in 1991.

Loge, polee, lumber and plywood; flrewood; other mine products; and copra and coconut gave the moet revenue and the largest freight to the railway industry.
folle 3.12. Number ul Passengers, freight and Express Tunage, and Revenue by Philippine National Railways: 1975-1991

| $y$ | Passengers | ssengers | Revemus | MMRC |  | Revenue | Fruight. | Freight. | Revenue/ | Express | Eipress |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Carried ('000) | nevenic 1'000 pesus) | per Passenger | Passenyer Carricd | Revenue 1'000 pesos) | per Commuler | tons <br> loaded <br> ('000) | Revenue 1'000 pesos) | Freighl Ton (pesos) | Tong tuaded ('000) | Revenue 1'000 pesos) | Express <br> Ton <br> (pesus) |
| 5175 | 5399,6 | 32181.6 | 5.96 | - | - | - | 280.6 | 9383.1 | 33.14 | 69.4 | 8036.5 | 115.80 |
| \$1976 | 4255.0 | 44330.0 | 10.42 | - | - |  | 208.6 | 6073.1 | 29.12 | 56.1 | 5736.6 | 101.71 |
| 197 | 4892.8 | 43791.0 | 8.95 | * | - | - | 194.3 | 6740.4 | 34.69 | 51.3 | 5267.6 | 102.68 |
| 4178 | 4012.4 | 39442.0 | 9.83 | - | - | - | 158.1 | 5152.2 | 32.47 | 37.2 | 3802.9 | 102.23 |
| 1979 | 3021.8 | 348.12 .0 | 11.53 | 3442.7 | 2422.6 | 0.7037 | 145.5 | 5783.4 | 99.75 | 34.2 | 4381.5 | 128.11 |
| 1980 | 2465.1 | 42435.0 | 17.21 | 4957.7 | 6502.0 | 1.3115 | 141.9 | 6440.5 | 45.39 | 24.8 | 4288.0 | 172.92 |
| 1781 | 1651.4 | 32252.0 | 19.51 | 6156.3 | 9321.9 | 1.5142 | 115.8 | 6729.9 | 58.12 | 18.2 | 3411.0 | 187.42 |
| T987 | 1316.2 | 21996.0 | 21.27 | 4335.9 | 7151.2 | 1.6493 | 19.2 | 5440.3 | 68.69 | 15.8 | 3642.0 | 230.51 |
| 2983 | 1375.6 | 36219.0 | 26.33 | 5142.2 | 9729.6 | 1.8971 | 65.3 | 5371.6 | 82.15 | 17.1 | 3989.0 | 233.28 |
| "194 | 1262.6 | 48799.0 | 38.65 | 4755.4 | 13093.0 | 2.7533 | 12.1 | 8851.4 | 122.17 | 21.6 | 6878.3 | 318.44 |
| $\sqrt{195}$ | 249.0 | 41974.0 | 56.04 | 2952.2 | 10206.9 | 3.4574 | 53.0 | 7667.4 | 144.67 | 19.4 | 6988.2 | 360.22 |
| 31986 | 209.6 | 45516.0 | 50.04 | 2834.1 | 7927.5 | 2.7966 | 64.0 | 7341.8 | 114.72 | 21.5 | 8116.7 | 371.52 |
| 1987 | 1177.8 | 61222.0 | 51.98 | 2024.0 | 5219.1 | 2.5786 | 61.2 | 7903.6 | 127.07 | 27.1 | 9452.8 | 341.26 |
| 1908 | 3 mb .1 | 614766.0 | 66.90 | 1182.1 | 2975.3 | 2.5170 | 57.0 | 7976.5 | 139.04 | 21.3 | 10091.2 | 433.10 |
| 1989 | 1004.7 | 69093.0 | 68.77 | 979.7 | 2519.1 | 2.5713 | 53.2 | 6861.6 | 129.00 | 21.5 | 9819.4 | -456.72 |
| 1990 | 328.0 | 74954.0 | 80.78 | 5560.8 | 12454.5. | 2.2197 | 32.2 | 3864.6 | 120.00 | 16.8 | 9281.2 | 552.4.5 |
| 1991 | 654.9 | 64432.5 | 98.39 | 4508.5 | 12777.1 | 2.8340 | 11.6 | 2135.5 | 184.10 | 10.3 | 8604.9 | 860.40 |

Clole: Metru Manila Commuter (MMRC) starled in 1979.
;Source: Philippine Nationál Mailkays and Metro Transit Drganization Jncorporated.

### 3.8.5. Government Support

The depressed situation in the automotive inaustry in 1987 prompted the President to issue E.O. No. 248 which gave the BOI authority to review the guidelines of the Progressive Car Manufacturing Program (PCMP) and the Progressive Truck Manufacturing Program (PTMP) in order to formulate new guidelines that would address more aptly to major problems facing the industry.

The guidelines of the PCMP, renamed the Car Development Program (CDP), were approved in December 1987. Participation in the program is open to active car aesemblers licensed by BOI under the PCMP as of October 1 , 1987 and to any new applicant who intends to use existing facilities of former but inactive PCMP participants.

The CDP guidelines presoribed a minimum vehicle content of 32.26 percent in 1988, increased the minimum content to 36.58 percent in 1989 and 40.0 percent in 1990. In addition, the gidelines stipulated that participants should earn one-half of their foreign exchange requirements for importation through exports.

### 3.9 The Textile Industry

The discussion below was summarized from Mercado (1986) and Flores (1990). Some of the data were urdated ubing the Forelgn Trade Statietice of the Philippines and the Philippire Yearbook.

The textile industry covers firms engaged in the manufacture of fibers, fabrics, and other textile-related goods such as bags, sacks, hosiery, thread, cordage, net, twine, etc. except garments. Textile fibers are either natural or man-made. The most common natural fibers are cotiton and ramie whereas typical examples of man-made fibers are nylon, polyester, rayon and acrylic.

Depending on the number of processing etages conducted, textile mills may be claseified into integrated mills (where all the three stages are performed in one plant) and nonintegrated mills (where only one or two of the three stages are done). The three stages are (1) spinning - the conversion of textile fibers into yarns and threade; (2) weaving or knitting - the processing of yarns and threads to
produce looms which are transformed into woven or knitted fabrics; and (3) finishing - the procees of bleaching, coloring or dying and/or treating with chemicals to come up with the finiehed textile. Non-integrated mills consist of spinning and/or weaving mills and other mills for knitting, dying, grey cloth finishing, cloth finishing, texturizing, twisting; hosiery and extrusion.

The textile industry was a heavily protected industry, protected by high tariffe and other devices such ae import restrictions and investment incentivee. The industry, however, inetead produced high-cost, low-quality textiles which could not compete with importe (Mercado, 1986). It wae aleo not capable of exporting subetantial guality products. There was no initiative to manufacture quality product, no advertieing, and no promotion whateoever (Flores, 1990).

A high degree of vertical and horizontal integration existe in the induetry but no competitive pressires. During the post war yeare of heavy tariffe, quantitative import restrictione and inveetment, incentives, the textile induetry had been inefficient and the induetrye capacity was greatly underutilized. The induetry'e equipment were aging and 11l-maintained. Other probleme besetting the industry were high coet of raw materials; low labor productivity; depreesed domestio market conditions; high interest rates; protectionist policies adopted by major induetrialized markets; and smuggling, which offered unfair competition to locally produced textiles (Mercedo, 1986; Flores, 1990). It is worth noting that the high cost of energy contributed likewise to the high cost of production of the textile mills.

### 3.9.1. Firms in the Industry

In 1981, there were about 130 firms in the industry $90 \%$ of which were located in Metro Manila. For the period 1980 to 1984, the industry declined annually by 6.25 percent. In 1984, only 83 textile firms were in operation in the Philippines.

Of the industry's rated capacity of about 1.22 million spindles, 19440 looms and an annual finishing capacity of 540.27 million metere of woven cloth, integrated mills accounted for $56 \%$ of total epindle capacity, $83 \%$ of total loom capacity, and $88 \%$ of total finishing capacity; semi-
integrated mille, $14 \%, 17 \%$, and $12 \%$, reapectively. Babic mille accounted for $30 \%$ of total spindle capacity. (Mercado, 1986.).

In 1980, the BOI estimated the capacity utilization rate of the induetiry to be 65\%. This was reduced to $50 \%$ in 1985.

In 1985, there were about one million epindles, 13,272 rotore, 19,500 looms, 2,818 knitting machinee, and 607 texturizing machinee (Flores, 1990).

As of 1989, the industry had 210 companies engaged in the production of yarns from natural and man-made fibers. About 54 were engaged in two or more processes. Ninety percent of these companies were Filipino-owned while 10 percent were owned by partnersh1ps.

The machinery and equipment used by the industry were mostly acquired during the 1950e and early 1960s. Hence, a large proportion of these were already obsolete. In fact, one of the major problems encountered by the industry in modifying and modernizing its machinery and equipment is the large amount. of capital requirement.

In the weaving sector, looms that were capable of production in 1986 numbered 14,247 with a capacity of 43 thousand metric tons. In 1989, the number of loome capable of production plus the number of rehabilitated onee were 10,635 with a capacity of 47 thoueand metric tons. The total number of looms declined but the total capacity increased due to the uee of modern machineries.

On the thole, 43 percent of the machineries used were acquired in the 1960 to 1970 period while 41 percent were rendered unusable.

After the 1986 receesion, the improvement in the economy in 1987-1988 created a blg consumer demand for textiles. Hence, old machines including spindles and looms were again used leading to improved maintenance and rehabilitation. This in turin, led to an inerease in output.

### 3.9.2. Raw Materiale

- The major raw materials of the industry comprise of raw fibers, yarns, dyestuffs, and chemicals like caustic
soda, hydrogen peroxide, and soda ash. Locally produced were polyester fiber, nylon fllament yarn, and some chemicals.

Most of the raw materials were included in the list of regulated commodities of the CB. Prior import clearance from the BOI was needed in all importations of eynthetic fibers, yarns and threads, hydrogen peroxide and caustic eoda.

The import restrictions on raw materials resulted in oreating monopolies. Hence, the inefficiency in the production of an intermediate input tends to spread within the industry which uees the said input.

Polyester staple fiber accounts for $60 \%$ of the total raw materiale used in the manufacture of textile. Ae part of the import eubstitution policies of the government, the manufacturers of polyester, Filipinoe Synthetic Corporation (FILSYN) and Lakeview Induetrial Corporation were incorported in 1969. and 1972, respectively. These plante, however, were small and did not achleve the needed economies of ecale. Their production coste aleo increabed because of high interest rates and power coste. Polyester production wab aleo eaid to be highly capital intensive. Due to financial eetbacke, Lakeview Induetrial Corporation wae compelled to become part of Filbyn in 1983 (Flovee, 1994).

In 1986, the eole local eupplier of btaple fiber had acquired a monopoly over polyeeter balee as the government required mills to purchase fibers from local suppliers up to the quantity these firme can supply. Suppliere of raw materials were required in turn to sell the materials at prices equivalent to the landed cost of imports.. Hence, the Textile Mills Association of the Philippines (TMAP) denounced the monopoly firm for selling polyebter fiber at a price higher by $43 \%$ than the cost of importing the fiber. Other complaints of the textile millers were the unreliable supply, low quality, and high cost of polyester fiber. In addition, the millers could not take advantage of the low worild prices for fiber (Mercado, 1986).

Polyester importe went up from $\$ 14.7$ million in 1987 to $\$ 20.3 \mathrm{million}$ for the period January to November 1988. The country"s polyester production could not meet domestic demand. Also, polyester products of other countries were of better quality and with lower prices (Flores, 1990).

In 1985, one of the two local manufacturers of nylon filament yarn stopped operating. Studies undertaken in 1982
and lysd concluded that there was excess capacity ior nyton filament in the country and that the operations of the two plants would no longer be viable (Mercado, 1986).

To a large extent, production of cotton was controlled by a eeml-govemment-owned corporation. Although domestic cotton production. improved, Belf-bufficiency in cotton production wae then still far behind. As reported by the millers, the pricee of domestic cotton and those of imported cotton lint were almost the same.

Of the chemicale and dyes used particularly in the dyeing and finiehing, and texturizing etages, Flores (1990) reported that there were no etatietical data on the quantity ueed by the industry. Her inquiriee with TMAP, however, revealed that about 80 percent of the chemicale and dyee were imported. Imported chemicals and dyestuffe increased from $\$ 27 \mathrm{mllil}$ ion in 1987 to $\$ 30$ mflition in 1988.

- For the years 1977 to 1989 , the raw material imports of the industry ranged from $\$ 86$ million in 1984 to $\$ 231$ million in 1989. Of the raw material importe, synthetic fibers had the biggeet average share of $34 \%$ followed by cotton, $28 \%$; textile yarn, $21 \%$; and other man-made fibere, $16 \%$.

During the same period, imports of fabrics, made-up articles and related products generally increased from $\$ 51$ million in 1977 to $\$ 386$ million in 1989: Woven man-made and cotton fabrios accounted for an average of $40 \%$ and $6 \%$ of total imports, respectively; knitted or crocheted fabrics, $30 \%$; and special textile fabrice, $15 \%$.

In 1980, 1982, and 1984, prices of domestic raw material inpute were on the average $48.6 \%, 55.4 \%$, and $119.3 \%$ higher than equivalent import prices. For the same years, domestio textile output pricee were $0.50 \%$ higher, $17.5 \%$ lower; and $18 \%$ higher than equivalent import prices.

### 3.9.3. Demand for Textile Products

Final coneumers demand for textile producte consiet of demand for made-up textile articles and inpute in the production of garments and made-up textile products, and in other allied industries.

Smuggled fabrics were sold at prices lower than prevailing market prices as these goods were untaxed. A
report on a study about emuggled fabrice in 1983 estimated these goods to be about $25 \%$ of total textile bales yearly, about 72.5 billion in revenues and $\$ 300 \mathrm{mllilion}$ in foreign exchange lost to the government anmually. According to the TMAP, Bmuggling of textiles especially polyester fiber could be attributed to the big disparity between local and international pxice (Mercado, 1986).

The supply for the domestic market came from the local textile manufacturers and from the emuggling of fabrics and garments. Floree (1990) reported that the percentage supplied by gmuggling activities was quite significant, even larger than the imports used for the domestic market.

Other than the barter trade in Mindanao, smuggling in the textile industry maybe either technical or direct. Technical smuggling wae done by export garment manufacturere. For instance, manufacturers import fabric and yarn in excess of the production requiremente and sell the excese to the domestic market. They may also understate the size and volume of the imported textiles. Direct smuggling may involve the misdeclaration of imported goode ab low value iteme (Floree, 1990).

The outlet for fabrice produced by the integrated mills was mainly the Divieoria wholesaling network. Due to the high operating coste of these mille (attributed to their multiple product linee and machineries), the mille could operate only if the market is erotected. These coets and the lack of development of new fabrioe made amugeling a luorative businees. Importation likewlee went up as a reeult of the inoreaeing demand of the RTW businees in the 1970e and 1980e (Floree, 1990).

The results of a consumer survey undertaken by the SGV in 1987 reported that about $40 \%$ of all fabric purchases pertained to knitwear. In early 1989, there was a rlse in ready to wear knitted garments in the form of "T" shirts.

There were a lot of small, family-owned firme in the knitting sector. Because of their lower operating costs large companies had difficulty in competing with them.

About $90 \%$ of total demand was for apparel use, $75 \%$ of which was for the domeetic market and $14 \%$ for export. Although no supply/demand gap in the domestic market was reported, there was an increasing trend in importation as local textile manufacturere could not meet. the quality specifications of the garment export sector.

The Philippine garments industry depends greatly on imported raw materials. The poor quality and higher prices of local fabrics and the inability of mills to meet delivery schedules were cited as the major reasons for this dependence on imported materials (Mercado, 1986). Through the BOI-approved bonded warehouses on export proceesing zonee, the materials are imported for re-export duty free.

### 3.9.4. Exporte of 'extiles

Exporte of textiles were insignificant with an average share of 0.7 to $1.3 \%$ of total exports for the period 1975 to 1989. Garmente exporte had the lowest average share of $4.7 \%$ in 1975 and the highest of $19 \%$ in 1987.

For the period 1977 to 1989 , textile exports varied from $\$ 34$ militon in 1977 to $\$ 87$ million $\ln 1989$. Of the textile exporte, epecial textile fabrice and related products had the highest average share of $33 \%$ while woven textile fabrics other then of cotton or man-made fibere had the lowest at $0.9 \%$.

The major importere of the country"s garments and textiles were the U.S. and EEC.

### 3.9.5. Government Policies

In the early 1950s, the local textile industry was developed as an import substitution industry. In 1949, the government imposed import and foreign exchange controls, hence, reducing imports of textile and increasing the price of imported fabrics. Many textile finiehing mille were put up as the CB was liberal in the granting of dollar quota allocations for the importation of grey goode, the besic input in textile finishing.

In the second half of the 1950 s , the industry proceeded towards integration, either backward or forward because of government incentivee which included financial assistance and tax exemption privileges.

In 1963, the decontrol program removed the limits on the importation of textile goods. Rampant smuggling and unlimited importation of textiles existed. Although anti-
smuggling measures were imposed, such were looeely implemented.

Effective April 1972, imports of fabrice and textilee including synthetic fibere and yarne, hydrogen peroxide and oauetio Boda were restricted in order to protect the local textile induetry. In Sept. 1974, more producte were restricted. In January 1975, with the implementation of MAAB no. 1, all importe of eynthetic yarns and fibere were to be referred to the CB. With MAAB no. 2 in Januaxy 1982 , importations of epun yarn and eewing thread needed prior BOI authorization. With Circular no. 1050 1seued in Feb. 1985, textile 1tems/fabrics, synthetic yarns, fibere and threads were included in the list of regulated producte which required. BOI clearance/permit. In July 1982, MAAB no. 25 required prior clearance from the BOI for all importations of hydrogen peroxide. The importation of liquid caustic soda needing prior clearance from the BOI was effected with the signing of MAAB no. 49 in November 1982.

Ae of 1986, importation of most inputs and outpute of the industry were being monitored but there were no limite on quantity and value.

### 3.9.6. Tariff Rates

The tariffs on selected textile items from 1972 to 1978 are presented in Table 3.13. Higher tariffs were levied on imports of fibere which were aleo produced locally. The duties on fibere were lower than on yarns. Tariffe on yarns were lower than fabrics.

Prior to 1973 , tariff ratee on woven and knitted fabrics depended on the state and type of fabric. Effective January 1973 with the amendment of the Tariff and Custom Code, the duty on woven and knitted fabrics was fixed at $70 \%$ ad valorem. Local independent finishers were therefore less protected since their raw materials were charged the same duty as finished fabrice. Local finiehere who had their own weaving and/or spinning facilities were not affected. Technical smuggling through misdeclaration was also prevented.

By 1980, nominal tariff rates again increased as the stage of procegeing paseee from fiber through to fabric. Tariff rates on cotton, man-made fibers, yarn, woven fabrica, and knitted fabrics were at the minimum $10 \%$, 10 -

Table 3.13. Ad Valorem $^{1 /}$ Tariffs on Selected Textile Items, 1972, 1973, and 1978 (In percent).

| Item | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effective } \\ & \text { Jen. 21, } 1972 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effective } \\ & \text { Jan. 1, } 1973 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effectiv } \\ 1978 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cotton | Free | 10 | 10 |

Man-mąde fibers (discontinuous), not carded, combed or otherwise prepared for spinning:

| A. Articles not. included in subheading $b$ hereof | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B. Polyester staple fibers, except when imported directly by textile spinning mills under prior joint authorization of the TC and the BOI | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Cotton Yarn, not put up for retail sale. | 70 | 70 | 50 |

Yarn of man-made fibers (continuous), not put up for retail sale:

| A. Articles not included in subheading b hereof | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B. Polyester yarn, except when imported directly by textile mills under prior joint authorization of the TC and the BOI | 50 | 50 |  |
| B. ${ }^{2 /}$ Polyester yarn, except when imported directly by textile mills under prior joint authorization of the TC and the BOI |  | - | 50 |
| Woven fabrics of Cotton | $\begin{gathered} 40 \overline{3} / \\ 100^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 70 | 70 |
| Woven fabrics of man-made fibers (continuous) | $\begin{gathered} 75 \overline{3} / \\ 100^{3} \end{gathered}$ | 70 | 70 |
| Knitted or crocheted fabric, not elastic nor rubberised | $\begin{aligned} & 65-3 \\ & 70^{3} \end{aligned}$ | 70 | 50 |

 2 higher than the tex or domestic production.
$2 /$ New subheading, introduced only in P.D. No. 1464. .
3 When range is given, the presented heading has sub-headings.
Source: Mercado (1986).
$30 \%, 30-50 \%, 70 \%$, and $50 \%$ respectively. Rates of effective protection became higher with the value added in each process in the textile manufacturing chain.

As set out in the Tariff and Customs Code of 1982, from 1980 to 1984 tariffe on cotton remained at $10 \%$, polyester staple fibers changed from $30 \%$ to $20 \%$, other man-made fibers from $10 \%$ to $20 \%$, cotton yarn from $40 \%$ to $30 \%$, polyester yarn and nylon yarn from $50 \%$ to $30 \%$, other yarn of man-made fibers remained at $30 \%$, woven fabrics decreased from 60\% to $40 \%$ and knitted or erocheted fabric, from $50 \%$ to $40 \%$. The average tarlff on chemicale and dyes was reduced to $31.25 \%$ from $41.25 \%$.

The tariff reform program became inoperative in 1984 due to import restrictions. Executive Order No. 926 of December 1983 ralsed the tariff on polyeater fiber importe from $20 \%$ to $30 \%$ and reduced the import duties on acryllic and rayon from $20 \%$ to 10\%. Under the 1982 Tariff and Custome Code, polyeeter fiber could be imported at $10 \%$ duty and $30 \%$ duty, respectively with and without prior authorization from the BOI. For polyester filament yarn and nylon filament yarn, these items could be imported at $30 \%$ duty with prior authorization from the BOI and at $50 \%$ duty in 1981 and $40 \%$ in 1982 without the authorization. Effective January 1983, the 1982 Code wae supposed to remove the requirement for BOI authorization and eet a uniform duty of $20 \%$ for imports of polyester fiber and $30 \%$ for polyester and nylon filament, yarn importe. The iseuance of Executive Order no. 926 made the tariff changee ineffective.

Table 3.14 shows the new set of tariff ratee for 1987 and 1988.

Table 3.14. Tariff rates in 1987 and 1988.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Duty } \\ & 1987 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Duty } \\ & 1988 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (\%) | (\%) |
| Cotton Fiber | 10 | 10 |
| Acrylile Fiber | 10 | $10$ |
| Rayon | 10 | 20 |
| Polyester Staple | 30 | 20 |
| Polyester Filament | 30 | 30 |
| Nylon Filament | 40 | 40 |
| Spun Yarne | 30 | 30 |
| Sewing Thread | 30 | 30 |
| Knitted Fabrics | 40 | 40 |
| Woven Fabrice | 40 | 40 |
| Denim | 40 | $40^{\circ}$ |
| Garments | 50 | 50 |

Source: A Review of the Textile Sector, 1986 Flores (1990)

1/ Raised to $20 \%$ on the premature expectation of a Ph1lippine Rayon Plant starting up.

### 3.9.7. Government Programs

The textile industry was in the list of induetrial sectors for rehabilitation under the $B O I$ : Investment Priorities Plan for 1986. There wae aleo a modernization program for the industry to be financed by a World Bank loan amounting to $\$ 157.4 \mathrm{million}$ but this conelsted only of onethird of the total financial requirements of the program. The remaining two-thirds came either from the participating mills or from the government in the form of guaranteed suppliers credit. There were other requirements from the participating mills such as technical manpower training program, energy conservation, and environmental pollution control measures. The rehabilitation plan was scheduled from 1982 to 1985. Due to depressed economic situation and financial difficulties, there were only few takers of the World Bank loan. The Central Bank then had to administer some of the funde for relendine to export-oriented enterprises. Other funde were returned to the World Bank in 1984 (Mercado, 1986).

A tax oredit scheme for local textile millere approved by the BOI and the then Ministry of Finance for the industry was implemented in 1985 to be able to reduce 1 te operation coste so that fabrice would be sold at lower prices free of tax and duty to the germente export induetry (Mercado, 1986; Floree, 1990). To finance the importation of raw materiale by textile mille, $\$ 50$ miliion of the World Bank loan would be utilized.

In selling looally-produced fabrics to the garment induetry textile mills would be given tax credit certificates equivalent to the tax and duty that garment firme would have paid ehould they import the raw materiale. The tax rebate to the millers allowed the induetry to sell fabrics at lower prices to garment exporters.

### 3.10. Concluding Remarks

On the description and analysis of the marketing systems for inputs and outputs of RNEs, the available reports, etudiee, and publicatione do not differentiate the marketing systems for small and big RNEe. The discussions largely focused on the industry as a whole. Therefore, to determine whether the marketing eystems for small RNEe differ subetantially from those for big RNEe would need a study of specific products from each of these two groupe. This would probably necessitate a survey of sample establishments within each type of industry to obtain the needed data and information.

To a certain extent the size of the RNEe has been considered in the discuseion. This le baeed on the type or product handled. For example, the beverage industry was deseribed to have been dominated by a mall number of firme and may be characterized ae oligopolietic. The beer sector was monopolistic until 1979.
similarly, it was prointed out that there were only 12 wholesale tobacco dealers (WTDe) in 1989 (whioh implies that they are relatively large), eeven in Virginia tobacco and the others in burley and native tobacco. About $60 \%$ of the total. Virginia tobaceo eupply ia handled by two WTDe. Furthermore, of the 11 cigar and cigarette manufacturers, it was estimated that two companiee control $90 \%$ of the market for aromatic elgarettes.

Although limited, eome qualitative aseebement of the effecte of eome policiee were made. Import restrictions on raw materiale used by the textile induetry reeulted in oreating monopolies (or oligopolies). This wae a consequence partly of the import eubstitution folloiee and high production ooete due to high interest ratee and power coete. These led to the merging of manufacturere of polyester whose plante were small and the needed economies of scale could not be achieved.

Another example applies to the coconut oll industry. The UNICOM (United Coconut Oil Mille, Inc.) was eetabliahed in 1979 to adjust the milling capacity to more realistic levels. In the late 1970s, there was an overinvestment in coconut ofl mille as a reeponee to incentives granted by the BOI. In 1979, however, copra production wae quite low, resulting in fierce competition for the available copra among oil millere, copra exportere, and refiners. This led in turn to a very low utilization and financial difficultiee of mills. Hence, UNICOM engaged in and coordinated buying, seliing, milling and refining of coconut producte and became the largest seller/exporter of copna and coconut oil, thue limiting competition in the milling sector, marketing of copra and coconut oil.

In the fertilizer industry, fertilizer plants were strategically located to satiefy increabe in demand particularly due to government incentives for rice, corm, sugarcane and other typee of farme to apply fertilizer. However, 1noreased production coets due to high cost of imported raw materials forced two companies to shut down their plants. Fertilizer production was also reduced and eventually stopped by another company. In 1984, fertilizer prices soared due partly to the global oil crisis and to the scarcity of foreign exchange. Production declined to a record low.

## CHAPTER 4

## POLICIES RELATED TO NONFARM ENTERPRISES

### 4.1. Goals and Objectives of the Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan

The Medium Term Philippine Development Plan for 19931998 states that the induetrial sector shall be geared towarde the attalnment of the following major goale: (1) industrial restructuring for worldwide competitiveness and expanded production of goode and eervices for the domeetic and export markete; (2) strong productive and ecologically sound links between agriculture and. Induetry; and (3) increasing income, productivity and access to resources among emall entrepreneure.

To attain these major goale, the specific objectivee relevant to rural nonfarm enterprises are defined as follows:

1. Rural induetrialization including the dispereal of industries to regions outeide the National Capital Region (NCR);

2: Modernization of the production sectors through technology upgrading;
3. Economic employment of men and woinen workers and employers as partners in the development process.

The Plan envisions GVA in manufacturing to grow at 9.0 percent annually during the Plan period to increase from 25,4 percent in 1993 to 27.7 percent in 1998. Industrial GVA 18 targeted to have the highest growth rates in Central Visayas, Southem Tagalog, Southern Mindanao, Central Luzon, and Central Mindanao.

To achieve these targete and goals requires strategiee and a, policy environment conducive to growth. These policies and etrategies for the induetrial gector include the following:

1. Provide assistance for product development and standardization:
2. Fureue an aggressive and focueed export promotion program that is product-and-country-apecific, including the provieion of financial, marketing, technical and institutional assistance by: (a) ensuring access to export and guarantee scheme; (b) continuing researoh and development, including improved trade negotiations, publicity and imagebuilding fromotions for the country; (c) providing training and technical assistance to exporters in design and packaging and product quality improvement; (d) implementing trade assistance and information networking sohemee; and (e) simplifying export procedures.
3. Fromote invertmente consietent with the Agroinduetrial Development etrategy by: (a) further eimplifying regietration requirements, (b) further reviewing foreign equity limitations with a view to relaxation; (c) improving the security of forelgn land tenure through longer land leages, extension of the condominium law to cover factories/buildings on induetrial lande; and (d) improving the investment climate by completing the programs for privatization and deregulation, upgrading infrastructure, and securing peace and order.
4. Strengthen anti-dumping laws and procedures to protect domestic, industries from unfair trade practices; and
5. Frovide time-bound and performance-based incentives in a few carefully eelected areas to promote investment in environment-friendly technology and for other purposes aritical to agro-induetrialization.

To adopt a location-specific and ecosystem-based approach to agri-industrial development, regional growth centere and growth networke/coree outeide Metro Manila will be identified using the following criteria: (a) marketability of producte; (b) atrategic location; (c) ecosystem implications; and (d) minimum infraetructure requiremente.

Regional growth centers will be developed through the implementation of Regional Industrial Centers (RICb) Program the with following order of priority:
REGION GROWTH CENTER SFTE OF EXISTING/PROPOSED

INDUSRIAL AREA

| VII | Metro Cebu | Mactan EPZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X | Cagayan de Oro | PHIVIDEC IE |
| IV | Cavite. City | Cavite EPZ |
| III | Mariveles, Bataan Subic, Zambalee | Bataan EPZ |
| CAR | Baguio City | Baguio City EPZ |
| XII | Iligan City | Ma. Cristina-Fuentes |
| XI | Davao City | Panacan, Panabo, Ilans |
| I | San Fernando, La Union | Bacnotan |
| XI | General santoe City | Hectenda Eepina |
| IV | Batangas. City | Tabungao-Bauan |
| VI | Iloilo City | Pavia |
| IX | Zamboange City | Aymla-Recodo |
| V | Legarei City | Lamba |
| VIII | Tacloban City | New Kawayan |
| II | Cauayen <br> Sta. Ana, Cagayan | Cauayan, Ieabela Port Irene |
| ARMM | Parang | Polloc, Parang, Maguindaneo |
| XII | Cotabato City | (not yet identified) |

In addition, growth networke/cores which link two or more growth centere will be developed. In order of priority, the following have been identified:
a. Cavite-Laguna-Batangas-Rizal-Quezon (CALABARZON)
b. Cagayan de Oro-Iligan
c. Northweetern Luzon Growth Quadrangle (Laoag-San Fernando-Dagupan-Baguio)
d. South Cotabato-Davao-Zamboanga
e. West Central Luzon (Bulacan-Fempanga-Bataan-
f. Cebu-Ilo1lo-Tacloban
g. Naga-Iriga-Legabpi
h. Tuguegarao-Ilagan-Cauayan.

The Regional Development Councile (RDCe) and Local Government Units (LGUs) in the growth centers will be encouraged to dreot and manage the development of their respective localities. Moreover, LGUs will be encouraged to promote indigenous activities where their provinces have existing or potential comparative advantage.

Commodities and activities that have competitive potential, are strategic or eritical to agri-industrial development will be promoted. Amons these goods and services are:
a. animal feed ingredients;
b. cutflówers;
c. cotton;
d. fiber (abaca, ramie, ealago, maguey);
e. fisheries;
f. sugar;
g. coconut;
h. cattle, carabao and dairy;

1. swine and poultry;
j. fruits (tomatoes, pineapple, banana, mango);
k. vegetables, legumes and nuts (garlic, mongo and peanuts);
2. essential ofls (citronella);
m . fashion açeseories;
n. metal engineering products (including machinery and equifment, tool and die and metal componente);
-o. Bhipbuilding and repair;
f. processed. fruits and vegetables (including ethnic food);
q. marine products (including prawn, seaweed, carageenan);
r. gifts, toys, and housewaree;
s. furniture;
t. textile filament (silk);-
u. garmente; and
v. electronics (hardware and software).

Babic commodities and industries wan ase wailcal to agri-industrial development include rice, corn, basic metals, chemicals and chemical products, electricity and gas and petrochemicals.

Institutional support euch as production and postproduction facilities, and other support requiremnts for the above commodities, induetries and services will be provided. Likewise, community organizations and cooperatives will be promoted and strengthened to help build the social infrestructure needed to facilitate access to production inputs, organize marketing of products, and mobilize rural credit and savings.

To enhance labor and employmen particularly in the rural areas the following programs will be implemented/developed:

1. Business program for rural women microenterpreneurs in nonfarm enterprises
2. Upgrading of outreach ekille training programe
3. Voluntary approaches to labor diapute and settlement .
4. Expansion of livelihood programs for rural workers
5. Special employment assietance prograns for educated and laid-off workers through the setting up of micro-processing projects with technical assistance and credit component.

Below are some specific policies affecting nonfarm enterprizes.

### 4.2. Exchange Rate Policy

In the late 1950 s , the heavy import dependency of the new industries led to a worsening trade deficit and prompted the government to begin rationalizing the exchange rate by having a multiple rate gystem that effectively devalued the domestic currency in import transactions. In 1962, the feso was freely convertible at the market rate (Bautista et al, 1879). . Controle on all foreign exchange transactions were immediately removed initially by adopting a floating rate. The rate was later established at 23.90 per dollar which was supported by the Philipppine National Bank, The Central Bamk and by standby credite from international eources, including the Internatonal Monetary Fund (IMF). From 1962 to November 1965, however, exportere were not able to take full advantage of the new exchange rate because the Central Bank exchenged their dollar earninge at $30 \%$ of the prevailing exchange rate (The $20 \%$ retention scheme was designed as a temporary measure to check inflationary preesures and to prevent an undue redistribution of income in favor of the exchange depreciation arising from decontrol). It wae only after 1965 that exporters were allowed to convert $100 \%$ of their dollar earnings at the prevailing exchange rate thue eignalling a nore complete devaluation (Sicat, 1972).

CB Circular 289 dated February 21, 1970 provided for the flosting of the domestic currency which was passed ae a direct response to a balance of payments crisis resulting from the need to service short-term credit that. financed the trade deficite of the 1960s (Bautista, et. al., 1979). This exchange rate policy called for the adoption of the flexible exchange rate for the peso for all foreign exchange
traneactions except for the eurrender of the export proceede of the leading export products such as logs, centrifugal. eugar, copra, and copper ore and concentrates. Eighty percent of all the export proceeds of these products were to be sold at the established par value of 23.90 to $\$ 1$. Twenty percent of the receipts were corvertible at the prevailing free market rate (Sicat, 1972).

Sicat (1972) stressed that the policy, was a stark departure from the 1962 decontrol measure, which penalized across-the-board all export receipts by requiring all exporters to suriender $20 \%$ of their earninge at the parity rate of E 2 to $\$ 1$. Under this setup, any new export product recelved its full measure of peso value (derived from the market-determined exchange rate) with the above mentioned exemptions. In May 1970, however, with the passage of the export tax, the $20 \%$ retention scheme was abolished.The export tax under RA 6125 impoged a "standardization tax on the gross f.o.b. peso proceeds" in traditional exports or a diminishing rate for two classes of traditional exports, namely:
a. logs, copra, centrifugal bugar, copper ore and concentrates: 10\% for the first year in 1970/71; 8\% in 1971/72; $6 \%$ in 1972/73; $4 \%$ in the last year, 1973/74.
b. molasses, coconut ofl, desslcated coconut, iron ore and concentrates, chromite ore and concentrates, copra meal or cake, unmanufactured abeca, unmanufactured tobacco, veneer and sheets, plywood, lumber, canned pineapples and bunker fuel in the following diminiehing rates: $8 \%, 6 \%, 4 \%, 2 \%$ in the last year. This export tax was applied aleo to export products whose aggregate annual value ghall have exceeded $\$ 5 \mathrm{M}$.

According to Pante and Medalla (1990), the exchange rate policy embodied in CB Circular 289 eeem to have used ineffectively in adfusting. imbalances in the country external accounts. From 1974 to 1982, nominal exchange rates exhibited a generally depreciating trend, but the rate of depreciation was kept at about $3 \%$ per year. Meanwhile; the inflation rate in the country accelerated from $5: 3 \%$ per annum in the 1960 s to $14 \%$ from 1973 to 1983 , a much higher rate of increase as compared with the major trading partners of the Philippines. Thus the limited nominal adjuatments in. the exchange rate resulted in real effective rates that wexe appreciating at the bame time that trade and current account deficits were rapidly building up.

Hence, real GNP Erowth progreselvely slowed down from 1979 to 1983 , so with industrial and manufacturing growth rates. In the second half of 1983 , unsettling political evente triggered by the assasination of the late Sen. Aquino caused international banke to halt further lending to the Philippines and called their short term loans which in turn led into a full blown debt and balance of payment crisis.

The immediate reeponse of the government was to devalue the peso three times between 1983 and June 1984, resulting in $46.1 \%$ depreciation of the peso for the period. There were alao Bevere forelgn exchange restrictions, wide ranging import controls and additional import duties and export. tasea whloh were quite inconelstent with the long-run goal of rationalizing the protection structure embodied in the trade reform program inttiated in 1980. These measures were replaced towarde the end of 1984 by better expenditurem reducing polioy instrumente, which included, among others, the tightening of monetary polloy, the reduction of budget deficits and a more flexible exchange rate policy.

From 1986 to 1989, the peso depreciated by only $6.6 \%$ againat the US dollar while the effective rate depreciated by $16.7 \%$ from 1986 to 1988 mainly because of changes in currencies of the major trading partners of the Fhilippines. Hence, the peso hardly moved in 1989 in spite of the rapid build-up of the country's trade and current account deficita in that year. In mid-1990 when the peso was under heavy presgure in the foreign exchange market due to the uncertainties arising from the Middle East war, among othere, the CB tried to stablize the peso through exchange market intervention. The CB likewise introduced a series of administrative, measures such as a tight band imposed on the official exchange rate for commercial foreign exchange transactions and a special arrangement that ensure the supply of foreign exchange to oll importers (Lambarte, et. al., 1991).

According to Krugnam, et.al (1992), the Philippine exchange rate regime is best described as managed by the CB in spite of the IMF classification as "freely floating." The CB manages the exchange rate by buying or selling forelgn exchange in the interbank market and through monetary policy. The latter ia resorted to support the peso when it 15 weak. When there ia an'exceas demand for foreign echange, the $C B$ sells debt instruments to make the interest wate high enough to make peso aseets attractive to private holders of dollars (In the mid-1980s, the CB borrowed directly, offering the Bo-called "Jobo Bills"). To buy peso debt, the investors have to sell dollars and buy
pesos. Hence, the debt 1ssue relleves presbure on the foreign exchange market and may even allow the CB to buy dollars without driving up their price.

The interest rate that must be paid to "flush out" dollars in this way must be one that offers an interest premium over that on dollare sufficient to compensate investors for the perceived risk of devaluation. Proximately then, interest rates in the fhilippines were driven for the most part by expectations about exchange rate movementa. The rising interest differential in 1989 essentially reflected concern that the peso was beooming overvalued, and that a depreciation would eventualiy become necessary.

Krugman, et al. (1992) asserted that the source of high nominal intereet rates in the Philippines is therefore not the competition of the government for a scarce supply of private savinge, but the need to offer interest rates high enough to compensate investore for the likelihood of future depreciation of the peso, a likelihood that arises in part because of expected inflation, but also. from a perception that the peso is overvalued in real terms.

### 4.3. Fiscal Policy

### 4.3.1. Income Tax from Businese

a. Frior to Executive Order 37 of 1986 , the tax rate echedule was one to 35 percent for compensation income and five to 60 percent for business, trade and professional income.
b. E.O. 37 of 1986 provided for the application of a unfform ( 1 to 35 percent) graduated rate schedule to the sum of oompensation, business, trade, and professional income. As before, compensation income was taxed on a modified grose income basis (1.e: grose income lees personal exemptione) whereas business/trade and professional income was taxed on a net income basis, l.e., grose income less personal exemptions less deductions for business expense. This deduction can be either a standard deduction or an itemized deduction where allowable itemized expense deductione include interest, ordinary business losses, bad debts, depreciation, charitable contributions, and others.

### 4.3.2. Tax on Paseive Inoome.

a. Prior to 1986, passive income was taxed as follows: 17.5 percent on intexest income, 15 percent on dividends and royalties, and five percent (based on gross belling price) on sales of real property, 0.25 percent (based on gross selling pirice) on sales of stock liated and traded through a local stock exchange and a $10-20$ percent tax on net capital gain from sale of stocks not traded through the local stock exchange.
b. The 1986 tax reform included the phasing out of the tax on dividends such that by January 1, 1989 , the tex rate on dividends was down to zero. It increased, however, the tax on interest income, royalties and winninge to 20 percent. The tax withheld by the payor represents the final tax liability of the payee and the latter is not required to atate the income on the individual tax return. The taxation syetem governing capital gains from stock or real property transactions did not change.

### 4.3.3. Corporate Income Tax

The 1986 Tax Reform fixed a unfform 35 percent tax on the net income of corporatione. Allowable deductions from gross income are ordinary business expenses, interest expenses, depreciation, bad debts, taxes, etc. (Manasan, 1990).

From 1968 to 1986, the tax on corporate net income was on a graduated basis, 25 percent (previouely 22\%) on the first slab of $\$ 100,000$ of net income and 35 percent (previously 30\%) on net. income of more than 100,000 (Manasan, 1990 and Gregorio, 1979). This dual rate syetem of corporate income taxation was firet introduced in 1959 and had increased over the yeare.

Available fiecal incentives to firms registered with the BOI were said to significantly affect the burden of corporate taxation (Krugman, et al 1992). With regard to tax incentives, regietered enterprises are entitled to tax incentivee in the form of exemption or reduction of certain taxes, deduction from taxable income or tax credits. These
incentives operate to reduce the initial cost of investment or reduce the income tax burden of enterprises. The following deductions from taxable income are allowed: regietered enterprisee are entitled to amortize and deduct organizational and pre-operating expenses for 10 years; accelarate depreciation of 1ts capltal assets; carry over net operating losees for a period of eix years; deduct from taxable income the amount re-invested for expansion of its facilities at varying percentages at $25 \%$ to $100 \%$ depending on the nature of the industry; and exporters of manufactured products may claim a double deduction of direct labor cost and indigenous raw materials ueed in the exported product up to an amount of $25 \%$ of export revenue.

A regietered enterpriee le also entitled to an exemption or reduction or deferment of taxes on imported capital equipment for the registered project. For export producte, a bpecial tax credit ie aviilable for taxes and duties paid for raw materials and supplies used to manufacture the export product. On the other hand, an enterprise engaged in a ploneer project is entitled to exemption from all taxes except income tax on a diminishing scale for a period of 15 years, extendible for another five years for exceptionally large projecte. There income tax holidays were introduced in the 1987 Omnibue Investment Code or E.O. No. 226.

### 4.3.4. Value Added Tax (VAT)

E.O. 273 introduced the value added tax in the Philippines to simplify the sales tax system, lessen its distortive effects, and increase the yield and responsiveness os salea taxes. It was signed in Jurie 1987 but actually took effect on January 1, 1988. The VAT replaced the manufacturer'e sales tax (with VAT-like featuree) and the turnover tax, the miller's tax, the contractor's tax, the broker's tax, the tax on leesors of perisonal property and a host of fixed taxes. It imposes a uniform 10 percent tax on the sale and importation of most goods and services (Manasan, 1990).

Furthemore, according to Manaean, exports are zerorated while agricultural producte, major inputs to agriculture with no alternative uses, e.g., fertilizers, perticides, animal feeds, etc., most of petroleum producta, books and other printed materials, utilities, financial, medical, educational, transport, communication and other
services and bales and/or servicee rendered by entities whose grose annual turnover is less than $\$ 200,000$ are exempt.

Zero-rated and exempt goode do not pay taxes on their outputa. However, zeromated goods are given a rebate on the taxes paid on their inputs while exempt goods are not.

On the other hand, the manufacturer's sales tax that was in place before the VAT had tax rates differentiated according to the essentiality of the goods; $0,10,20$, and 30 percent, respectively; for agricultural products, essentials, ordinary, and non-essential goods. In addition, a 1.5 percent turnover tax based on gross selling price was levied on each subsequent sale.

In 1979, non-essential and semi-essential items were taxed at 50 and $25 \%$, reapectively. Prior to July 1978, the rates were 70 and $40 \%$, respectively. Under the nonessential category were jewelries, perfumes, cosmetics and juke boxes. The semi-essential items consisted of leather luggagee and bage, water heaters, washing machinee, eleotric mixere, lighters, air-conditioning, planoe and most household appliances.

Esbential iteme which included locally processed meat, milk, fibh, and other bea foode, wheat flour, locally manufactured medicine, laundry soap, writing fads, notebooks and pencils, animal feeds and cement were taxed at $5 \%$. The tax for agricultural products was $1 \%$ and for all other commoditiee, $10 \%$.

Gregorio (1979) expounded also on some variations on the tax ratés. Lower rates or 10 to $25 \%$ depending on the price of the item were imposed on the locally produced versione of certain bemi-eseential goode like watches and clocks, fountain pens and ball pens, electric fans, stoves and ranges, photographs, radios, television sets, refrigerators, etc. Depending on the price, epecial graduated tax rates from 10 to $200 \%$ were charged likewise on domestically manufactured automobiles. Imported automokiles were levied tax rates ranging from 100 to $200 \%$.

Taxes on certain inputs may be credited against output taxes. However, the earlier tax oredit system is more immited than the one under VAT. In particular, under the previous Byetem, only taxes on inputs that physically form part of the finished product may be credited against output taxes. Under VAT, tax credite are allowed for taxes on all inputs which are within the VAT ambit.

The VAT ie complemented by an excise. tax on luxury items.

A lot of problems were encountered in the initial implementation of VAT. These problems could be attributed to the inadequate preparatory steps that were undertaken. The VAT was met with hostility and confusion by the public, the new laws and regulatione were unclear and not widely dibeeminated, etc. Krugman, et al. (1992) states that most of these problems have now been addressed.

### 4.3.5. Exclse Taxes

Before 1986, exclee taxes on alcoholic, tobacco and petroleum producte were levied in the form of unit taxes based on volume of production combined. with an ad valoxem component (Manasan, 1990).

The 1986 tax reform completely eliminated the unit tax such that now these excises are on an ad valorem basia. This resulted in a rising tendency for exclee tax revenues to go up automatically. with economic growth especially with increasing prices. However, Manasan (1990) contended that the reform of excise taxes on tobaceo products, the reintroduction of a higher rate on imported ( 65 percent) relative to domestically produced olgarettes ( 40 percent and 50 percent, depending on whether the cigarettes carry a forelgn brand or not, eeemed questionable. Fromoting the domestio manufacture of cigarettes could be bettex done by means of tariff protection.

The exclee tax rate on fetroleum products rose from an average tax rate equivalent of 26.3 percent of the wholesale price in January 1986 to a peak of 36.8 percent in March 1987. In Augurt 1987, it was reduced to an average rate of 25.4 percent. Concomitantly, the structure of petroleum product taxes acrose the varioue productis has also undergone some changes. Fixst, the excise tax rate on fuel oil, an important intermediate infut, went up relative to that of other petroleun products between January 1986 to August 1987. From then on, the exelse tax on fuel oll was abolished. It is worth noting that since taxes on petroleum products have traditionally
been a significant component of tax revenues the revenue reduction was not negligible (Manasan, 1990). Second, the differential texation of gasoline and diesel widened further in favor of dieael, i.e., gacoline became more heavily taxed relative to diesel.

The excise tax on fuel oll' which was increased from a rate of 16.6 percent prior to the Aquino administration to 28.5 . Fercent in March 1987 may have distortionary effecta on the production structure. This results from the fact that: (1) fuel oil is a major input in the production of a number of goods like cement, fertilizer, steel, logging and wood processing, textiles, rice, eugar, and coconut oil miling, food processing, eto.; and (2) there is no existing tax credit provision for taxee paid on, petroleum producta under either the oold aales tax system or the present value added tax.

Under the old sales tax system, taxes on petroleum products are not axeditable against the sales tax on the output because petroleum products do not physically form part of the end product. On the other hand, under the value added eystem

- that is currently in place, taxes on petroleum products are not creditable against output taxes because petroleum products are exempted from the VAT.
c. The 1990 tax measures include sharp increases in the excise tax on eo-called sin products such as cigarettes and beer.


### 4.3.6. Export Taxes

a. To lessen the windfull gains received by producers of traditional export commodities in the early 1970s, the stabilization tax impoeed temporary taxes of 4 to $10 \%$ ad valoren on such cemmodities. Furthermore, an additional tax was levied in February 1974 on the premium derived from the increaee in export price beginning in 1973. Thie premium export duty had rates from 20 to $30 \%$ and were applied to the difference between the ruling export price and the base price. However, when
increases. In the prices of commodities tapered down towards the end of 1974, the premium tax become ineffective (except for sugar in 1975) and eventhe regular export tax was temporarily withdrawn on export commodities hardest hit by the recession (Bautista, et al, 1979)
b. Prior to the. 1986 tax reforms, an ad valorem tax levied on the grose f.o.b. value of certain exports amounted 20 percent for loge, 15 percent for copra, nine percent for coconut oil, eight percent for copra meal and desiccated coconut, four percent for abaca, lumber and: veneer, pineapple and pineapple juice, and two percent for bananas (Manasen, 1990).
c. The 1986 tax reform package eliminated all export taxes except that on logs.

### 4.4. Trade Policies

Fast studies of industrialization in the Philippines concluded that the nature of governnent policies pursued since the 1950 a to promote industrialization in the country has caused a low record of productivity growth in the indugtrial sector and the failure to significantly help in the alleviation of unemployment, underemployment and poverty in the country (Pante and Medalla, 1990). These government policies included import substitution through import controls in the 1950s; high tariffs and quantitative reetrictions in the 1960 s and 1970 E . (The tariff code which took effect on January 1, 1973 was sald to simplify the previously very complicated tariff Bchedule by reducing the number of tariff rates to only bix. However, ILO indicated that it increased import duties on 796 items in the old tariff code, lowered them on 541 1tems and did not change the rates in 392 items.); accompanied by liberal financing and investment incentivee favoring large and capital intenaive industries, particularly in the 1970s; overvalued exchange rates; and increasing direct government participation in induetrial production.

The performance of the manufacturing sector during the period was characterized by Pante and Medalla (1990) ae having had:

1. Limited labor absorption
2. Declining total factor productivity :
3. Little change in structure. (The structure of production hae not changed much eince 1970, with the production of coneumer goods accounting for the largest share of about. one-half of manufacturing value added on the average, followed by the production of intermediate and capital goode).
4. Concentrated production structure in Metro Manila
5. Biaged structure against amall and medium scale industries. The import and exchange controls of the 1950 and, later, the import restrictions of the 1960s and 1970 b undoubtedly favored large enterprises which have both the economic and political power to influence the allocation of import licenses and foreign exchange. In addition; large firms had the advantage over SMIs in terme of their ability to transact businese with the BOI for the registration and availment of incentives. With respect to technology, large induatries have had access to forelgn technologies through licensing agreements or equity participation by foreign firms. The upgrading of the low productivity technology of SMIs has not recelved adequate government support. Export promotion measures have also not been neutral as to bize of firm, especially because of the cost of incentive availment and the late release of imported inpute for exports (Pante and Medalla, 1990).
6. Increasing share of nontraditional exports in total exports but nontraditional manufactured exports concentrated in only three products, namely semi-conductors, garments and handicrafts (which comprised two-thirds of all nontraditional manufactured exports). The share of nontraditional manufactured exports has risen only by 8.3 percent in 1970 to a little over three-fourthe in 1988.
7. Biased incentive structure in favor of capital intensity. Capital labor ratios increased elgnificantly in many subsectors of manufacturing, most probably in food, beverages, chemicals, cement, iron and steel, fabricated metals and transport equipment.

The Philippines has employed a restrictive trade regime to promote import-substituting industries, starting as early as the 1950s. There were short periods of decontrol but on the whole, the import-substitution bias has qersisted (Pante and Medalla, 1990).

Major trade reforms were undertaken in the 1980s. These trade reforms started in 1981 and contained three components, namely: (1) the 1981-85 Tariff Reform Program (TRF) the main feature of which was reduction of the maximum rate of duty from 100 fercent to 50 percent; (2) 1mport liberali-zation; and (3) indirect tax realignment. While TRP proceeded as plamed, the indirect tax reallgnment was implemented only in the later part of 1985 because of the balance of paymenta crisie which erupted in Auguet 1983.

The import liberalization program initiated in the early 19808 wae later expanded. From 1986 to 1989, import restrictions on 1,477 PSSC lines were lifted, reducing the number of regulated items as a percentage of the total number of $\operatorname{FSSC}$ linee from around 34.1 percent in 1985 to 8.0 percent by the end of 1989. In addition, all export taxes were abolished, except for logs.

On the whole, the trade reform frogram from 1986 to 1988 succeeded in bringing down nominal and effeotive rates of protection and in reducing variation acrose gectore. Nonethelese, Fante and Medalla (1990) opined that the implemented reforms have not been sufficient in altering the biases of the protection system against exports. Assessing the trade polioy regime as of the mid-1990s Krugman, et al. (1992) concurred with the same conclusion that the policy is highly blased againet trade. Accordingly, further reforms are needed to lower the level and dispersion of effective protection. Moreover, it is important for the government to continue the implementation of the import liberalization program as scheduled in order to give a consistent poliey signal to the private sector.

The current thrust of government policy in this area is towards greater trade liberalization and a near-uniform tariff of 15 percent. Hence, quantitative restrictions such as import bans and licensing requirements for importation on various items have been removed. Algo, the tariff range has been narrowed down through E.O. No. 470. While removing a number of items from the list of regulated imports, tariffs on these items were simultaneously raised through E.O. No. 8. The issue ralsed by theee reforme, however, is that there would be no gains in efficiency (although the government augments its revenue) if the new tariffe would be
as high as the quantitative protection (PIDS Poverty Study Group, 1992).

Reforms in the tariff structure under EO 470 began in Auguet 1991 when the total number of harmonized tariff lines were reduced by $10 \%$ from 6193 FSCC lines to 5561 lines. Reforms will end in July'1995, by which time tariff rates would have been clustered around four levels: $3 \%, 10 \%, \cdot 20 \%$, and $30 \%$ (DTI, July 1992). The tariff adjustments cover $80 \%$ of the items in the Tariff and Customs Code adhering to the babic text if the International Harmonized Coding Sybtem for easier customs administration. DTI also reported that imports of raw materials semi-processed materials and carital equipment were levied lower tariffs under E>Os No. 470 effeotive July 1, 1992. DTI added that before the lower ratea became effective; packaging materials such as cartoone, orates and similar articles were slapped a 50\% tariff duty. The current rate which is $40 \%$ is scheduled to be reduced to $30 \%$ in 1974 and to $20 \%$ in 1995.

In 1991, tariffe on dryers for agricultural producta, paper and paper board, bulldozers and machine tools were lowered from $20 \%$ to $10 \%$. Such reduction $1=$ expected to cut prices of essential inputs; lower price of coneumer goods; and enhance the competitiveness of local industries in the domestic and overseas markets. Import--dependent industries buch as packaging and paper, metal and engineering, electronics and consumer durables, and the agricultural sector would benefit from the tariff cuts.

### 4.5. Financial Policies

The objectives of the government's reform program in the financial sector are: (1) improvement of the financial structure through the strengthening of CB supervision and regulation of financial institutions, freer entry into. all areas of banking and finance to encourage competition and enhance the efficiency of financial intermediation, rehaibilitation and rationalization of the operatione of the Philippine National Bank (PNB) and the DBP, and divectiture of at least the majority stockholdings of governmentacquired banke by the end of 1988; (2) improvement of the rural eredit market through the rationalization and strengthening of the rural banking system; (3) rationalization of government regulations affecting intermediation cost, including the gradual reduction in reserve requirements when circumstances so warrant, repeal
of the agri-agra requirements and abolition of the grose receipts tax; (4) continued adoption of a market-determined interest rate policy through the elimination of all remaining forms of interest rate subsidies to specific sectors; and (5) development of the domestic capltal market through the strengthening of the securities market and the development of a secondary market for government securities. (See Lamberte and Relampagos (1990) for a more detailed discuseion of reforms in the financial bector during the period 1986-1988). A $\$ 300 \mathrm{M}$ Financial Sector Adjustment Loan has been extended by the World Bank to the Philippines to assist the government in the implementation of its reform program covering the financial sector (Pante and Medalla, 1990).

To improve the financial structure, the government has taken the following major actions: (1) expansion of the coverage. of the single borrower's limit to include contingent liabilities in the determination of the limit; (2) imposition of ceilings on outstanding guarantees that a bank can lesue; (3) adoption of the policy. whereby the. CB will. refrain from. sustalning weak banks except. In times of general financial emergency or when specific banks face problems of liquidity rather than of solvency; (4) relaxation of barriers to entry by terminating the moratorium on new bank licenses and eliminating the prerequisite investment in government securities for purposes of opening bank branches; (5) completion of the rehabilitation of PNB and DBP; and (6) divestiture of government stocks held in acquired banks (Fante and Medalla, 1990).

### 4.4.1. Interest Rate Policy

The Anti-Usury Law which gives a ceiling on the interest rates that maybe charged on loane is implemented to control the rate and direction of investment by influencing the structure of interest rates. Prior to 1978, the Law restricted the nominal intereat rate of lending by banks to $12 \%$. on secured loans and $14 \%$ on unsecured loans. Banks employ, however, various ways such as imposition of service charges and deduction of the interest charges upon approval of the loan instead of at maturity thus maining the effective interest rates as high as $15 \%$ and $16 \%$ in the early. 1970 b. Hence, In early 1978, the CB imposed a statutory limit on the effective rate of interest (nominal rate plue bank charges, etc.) instead of on the nominal rate - $12 \%$
effective interest rate for secured loans and $14 \%$ for unsecured loane (Mejia, 1979).

The Anti-Ubury Law also sete a $7.5 \%$ and $7 \%$ ceiling on deposit rates for savings bank and commercial banks, respectively. These rates are far below the cellings on lending rates.

The setting of ceilings on intereat rates on savings deposits and loans were, however, oriticized for oreating distortions in the capital market. To control the allocation of investments the $C B$ granted differential interest rates on loans for priority activities. Such loans were generally granted by government supported institutions but private banks were likewise encouraged to grant preferential rates to priority industries. From December 1971, the maximum interest rate that can be charged by conmercial and thrift banke, including other charges, on loans for export activities was $9 \%$ f for small-scale industries (albo for the production of rice and corn, poultry and piggery, fishing, feed grains and sorghum), $12 \%$.

In May and October 1978, adjustments were made to expand the coverage to include, among others, those listed under Priority I-A of CB Circular No. 223 and activities involving the production of copper, nickel metal and nickel and cobalt in mixed sulphides.

Listed belów are nonfarm enterprises falling under Priority I of CB Circular 223 as amended:
A. Economic Activities Eligible for Credits up to Eighty Percent ( $80 \%$ ) of Loan Value of Credit Instrument:

1. Base Metal Induatries
a) Blast furnaces, steel work and rolling mills
b) Iron and steel basic industries
c) Iron and steel foundries
d) Nonferrous metal basic industries
2. Chemical and Chemical Products
a) Basic chemicals
b) Druge and other pharmaceutical preparations
c) Fertilizer
3. Coconut Products and Their Preparation
a) Coconut oil, edible
b) Coconut oil, inedible
c) Copra meal and cake
4. Electrical Machinery, Apparatus and Appilances a) Transmission and distribution equipment
5. Food Manufacturing
a) Canning and preserving of fish and other sea foods
6. Fish canning
b) Canning and preserving of fruits and vegetables
i. Canning, drying, brining, pickling or otherwise preserving or preparing vegetables
11.. Canning, drying or otherwize preparing and preserving fruits
c) Slaughtering, preparation and preserving of meat.
d) Sugar factorles and refineries i. Sugar refining plants
e) Miscellaneous food preparation
7. Prepared feeds for animal and fowls
8. Furniture and Fixtures Manufacture a). Rattan and bamboo furniture
9. Leather and Leather Products
a) Tanning and finishing
10. Lumber and Wood Products
a) Veneer, plywood and prefabricated products
11. Machinery, Equipment, Accesbories and Parte
a) Agricultural machinery
b) Engines and turbinea
c) Induetrial, construction and mining machinery
12. Nonmetallic Products a) Cement
13. Paper and Paper Froducts
a) Pulp, faper and paperboard
14. Petroleum and Coal Products a) Coke
15. Textile. Cordage and Twinee Manufactures
a) Cordage, rope, twines and nets
b) Hemp milling, abaca stripping and baling establishments
c) Knitting mills
d) Spinning, weaving and finishing of textile
16. Traneportation Equipment and Parts
a) Alrcrafte and parts
b) Motor vehicles, equipment and parte
c) Motorcycles, bicycles and parts
d) Railroad equipment
e) Shipe and boats
17. Miscellaneous Manufacturing Industries
a) Laboratory, engineering and medical inetruments
B. Economic Activities Eligible for Credits up to SixtyFive Fercent (65\%) of the Loan Value of the Credit Instrument
18. Chemical and Chemical Products
a) Dyeing and tanning materials
b) Explosives (excluding firecrackers)
19. Coconut Products and their Preparations
a) Desiccated coconut
20. Electrical Machinery, Apparatus and Appliancee
a) Communication equipment
b) Dry cells and storage batteries
21. Food Manufacturing
a) Canning and preserving of fruits and vegetables and vegetables, sauces and
22. Fruits and vegetables, sauces and seasoning
b) Dairy producte
23. Milk processing
c) Miscellaneous food preparatione
24. Coffee roasting, grinding and/or Frocessing
25. Furniture and Fixture Manufacture
a) Wood furniture
26. Lumber and Wood Products
a) Cork
b) Sashes and doors
c) Sawn and planed lumber
d) Wood ch1ps
27. Machinery, Equipment Accessoriee and Parta
a) Office and store machines and devices
28. Métal Induetries
a) Cutlery, hendtools and general products
b) Fabricated structural and metal products
c) Tin and aluminum ware
29. Nonmetallic Products
a) Glase and glass products
b) Structural clay products
30. Textile, Cordage and Twines Manufactures a) Jute bage and sacks
31. Miscellaneous Manufacturing Industries
a) Cottage native handicraft industries
b) Footwear (other then rubber)
c) Photographic and optical goods
C. Economic Activities Eligible for Credits up to Fifty Percent (.50\%) of the Loan Value of the Credit Instrument
32. Apparel and Other Finished Products Made from Fabrice and Similar Materiale
a) Embroidery shope
b) Wearing apparel
33. Chemicals and Chemical Products
a). Faints, varnish and lacquers
b) Soaps and other cleansing preparation
34. Coconut Producte
a) Copra
35. Electrical Machinery, Apparatue and Appliancea
a) Eleotrical lamp
b) Household appliances
c) Radio, television, telephone receiving gets, electronic tubes and components
36. Food Manufacturing
a) Canning and preserving of fish and other sea foode
37. Fish eauce (patis) manufacture ii. Shellfish curing, emoking, salting or pickling n.e.c.
b) Cocoa, chocolate and sugar confectionery 1. Cocoa and chocolate processing factories
c) Grain Mill Producte
38. Corn mills

under Priority I-A of Circular No. 223 - $9 \%$ plue charges not greater than $1 \%$.
39. Those engaged in the production of cobalt and nickel metal - 6\% plus bank charges not greater than $2 \%$.
40. Those engaged in non-export oriented sinall-scale/ cottage industries under Priority $I-B$ and $C$ of Circular No. $223-10 \%$.

Financial policies were liberalized when the Monetary Board was authorized to set maximum lending rates starting in $1993^{\circ}$ rendering obsolete the Usury Act, of 1916. The period from 1974 to 1980 was considered the transition period for such financial liberalization. Interest ratee were still fixed but the Monetary Board constantly adjusted. the rates to reflect market conditions.

The floating interest period began in 1981 when interest rate cellinge on all types of deposite and loans except short-term were lifted. However, the celling on short-term loans were only lifted in 1983.

In 1984, a liquidity and balance of paymente crisis speeded up new financial ilberalization efforta in the form of floating interest ratee. The rates on time deposits increased from $14 \%$ per year in 1980 to $15.6 \%$ fer annum in 1981. It then soared to $32.5 \%$ in 1984 due to a $50 \%$ inflation rate (Gochoso, 1989).

Rediscount privileges were given by the CB to banks granting loans to feople engaged in priority production activities. The CB allowed lower rediccount rates for the more preferred activities, e.g. food production and exportoriented activities. In 1971, emall-scale and cottage industries began to recelve preferences in terms of rediecount privileges while in 1978, copper, nickel metal and nickel and cobalt in mixed sulphides were among the preferred areas.

In 1968, the redibcount rates which the CB charged for all banking institutions, except rural banke were $5.75 \%$ on borrowing secured by eligible oredit inetruments pertaining to export activities falling under Priority I and $7.5 \%$ on borrowing based on all other credit instruments. In 1971, the Rural Banks were given a rediscount rate of $3 \%$ per year for papers covering loane under a supervised credit system, including the production of escential food items, export-
oriented industries, cottage industries, and exportable manufactured products where no importerd materials are used.

For commercial and thrift banks (bavings and mortgage banks, stock bavings and loan aseoctations), the rediecount rates were adjusted in 1974. For financing and export activities, the rediscount rate was lowered from $5.7 \%$ to $5 \%$. For small-scale induetries, a rediscount rate of $5 \%$ was also set by the CB. Borrowinge on all credit instrumente pertaining to economic activities under Circular No. 223 were granted the following rediscount rates: Group A - $6 \%$, Group B - $7 \%$, and Group C - $8 \%$, for $80 \%, 65 \%$ and $50 \%$ of their loan values, respectively. When a bank grants a loan to a borrower under Group $A$, the $C B$ can lend the bank an amónt equivalent to $80 \%$ of the value of the loan of the bank to the borrower at an interest rate of $6 \%$.

From May 1978 till March 1979, the following were the rediscount rates granted for the various nonfarm priority activities:

1) Small-scale and cottage industries; exportoriented activities; copper and nickel metal production; and thoee lieted under Priority I-A of Circular No. 223 - 4\% for $80 \%$ of tle total loan value.
2) Activities under Friority $I-B$ and $C-9 \%$ for $60 \%$ of the loan value

Undex thie scheme, banks obtained a groes profit margin of slightly less than $4 \%$ for loans granted to copper and niokel metal production and almost $6 \%$ for the othere.

In April 1979, the CB revised its credit policies by relaxing ite rediscount rules so as to provide more funde to production. The rediscount rate on loans for exportoriented amall-scale and cottage induetries was lowered from $4 \%$ to $3 \%$. The loan value for papere of thie type was also increased from $80 \%$ to $100 \%$. Loans for food processing, domestic fertilizer production and food manufacturing for domestic consumption were likewise granted a $3 \%$ per year rediscount rate for $100 \%$ of the loan value. Loans for nonexport oriented small-scale and cottage industries under Priority $I-B$ and $C$ of amended Circular No. 223 recelved a $6 \%$ rediscount rate as compared with the previous rate of $9 \%$, for $80 \%$ of the loan value instead of $60 \%$.

The medium and long-term rediscounting facility allowed banks to rediscount papers for the acquisition of assets,
working capital, and invertment in affiliates and high grade securities. Whatever is the maturity, the CB allowed any paper to be accepted as security to encourage the transformation of short-term loans to medium and long-term loans. Banks, however, tended to fust borrow from the $C B$ rather than attempt to increase the supply of loanable funds by mobilizing savinge. This caused a reduction in the volume of financing vis-a-vis requirements (Gochoco, 1989).

Another CB regulation is the requirement from banke in the regions (outbide Metro Manila) to invest within the region where they are located at least 75\% of their total deposita. When $a$ bnak has two or more offices in a particular region, the policy is considered complied with if the aggregate investment of such banks offices is not below $75 \%$ of 1 te deposits held in that region, and provided that the bank devotes at least $60 \%$ of the $75 \%$ ratio of aggregate investment for loans financing agricultural and export induetries.

In line with the promotion of export-oriented activities and cottage industries, investment is aimed to be stimulated further by relaxing the rediscount ceiling for such activities. Starting 1978, any bank that was eligible to rediscount and whose rediscount ceiling had already been reached was entitled to an increase in its existing rediscount ceiling by $50 \%$ provided that the loan would be used exclualvely for the financing of nontraditional exporte, emali-bcale and cottage industries. In March 1979, commercial banks, for purgoses of rediscounting thedr export pagers with the $C B$, were allowed to avail. themselves of additional $50 \%$ beyond their existing basic rediscount ceiling.

Foreign borrowings and forejgn investments are likewise channeled to preferred areas. In the approval of foreign borrowinge and foreign investments, the CB gives preference to the following:
a) Export-oriented industries
b) BOI-approved industries
c) Non-export-oriented industries not utilizing domestic credit reeources
d) Firms using relatively labor intensive methods, and
e) Firms implementing geographical dispersal (i.e. located outside Metropolitan Manila)

### 4.6. Labor Policies and Programs

The government s overall policy direction for the labor sector is contained in the Medium Term Development Plan of the Philippines for 1987-1992. The Plan underscoree the promotion of employment through the use of more labor-based techniques in all productive sectors, the provision of means for labor to receive ite fair ehaxe and for capital to obtain a reasonable xeturn on investments. The setting of wages and other terms and conditione of employment through collective bargaining is being promoted. In addition, the workers have the right to organize, to free collective bargaining, and to strike in accordance with the law.

The Philippine Constitution which was ratified in 1987, likewise providee the general policy eetting for the labor sector. The Conetitution recognizee labor as a primary social economic force thus the state is mandated to provide full protection to labor, local and overseas, organized and unorganized, and promote full employment and equality of employment opportunities for all. The creation and promotion of employment, being a key factor in the reduction of poverty is one of the major concerne of the government.

### 4.6.1. Labor Lawe

Some of the lawe concerning labor and employment - relevant to rural nonfarm enterprises are the following:
A. Wages, ealaries and other forms of compensation

1. Republic Act (R.A.) No. 6640 - Paseed in 1987, this act provides for an increaee in the statutory minimum wage and salary rates of employees and workere in the private sector.
2. R.A. No. 6727 - Wage Rationalization Act - This act rationalizes the fixing of minimum wage to promote productivity improvement and gain showing to enhance employment in the countryeide through induetry diepereal; and to allow bueinees and industry reasonable returne on investment, expaneion and equitabiy coneidering exieting dieparitiee in the coet of living and other socioeconomic factore.
B. : Labor Relations
3. R.A. No. 6715 - An Act to extend protection to labor, strengthen the conetitutional pights of workers to self-organization, collective bargaining and peaceful concerted activities, forter induetrial peace and harmony, promote the preferential use of voluntary modes of settling labor disputes, and reorganize the National Labor Relations Commiseion, amending the Labor Code of the Philippines.
4. E.O. No. 47 - reorganized the National Labor Relations Commiseion in 1986 to professionalize the labor dispute settlement machinery and to clear NLRC of sectoral interest.
C. Labor 'Standards and Workere' Welfare
5. E.O. No. 28 - further amended in 1986, certain provielone of RA No. 1161 or the Social: Security Law. The E.O. provides for the feasible increages in beriefits and addition of new ones without increasing the contribution and for the constant upgrading of the benefit etructure for the low income group. Amendments cover monthly pension; funeral benefit and.sickness benefit.

The most recent adjustments in the minimum wage is Republic Act No.. 6727 also known as the Wage Rationalization Act, which allows for a 25 -peso increase in the minimum wage effective July 1989 of workers in the National Capital Region and outside exceept for those in the cottage/handicraft industries and business enterprises with a capitalization of not more than 7500,000 and employing not more than 20 workere. These workers would receive an increase of $F 15$ per day.

With the implementation of EO No. $178, \mathrm{RA} 6640$, and RA 6727, the legislated money wages of workers in both the public and private eectors increased. RA 6640 ralsed the minimum wage of Metro Manila non-agricultural workers to $p$ 69.33 per day. Effective July 1989 , the legislated minimum wage was $P$ 94.33. In real terms, however, these increases are very small for they have been eroded by rising prices of goode and services.

The National Wage Council (NWC) formulated a Wagu Policy Review Program which was aimed at determining an
alternative aystem of minimun wage fixing that will bring about better income distribution. The program consists of regular price monitoring and cost of living analysis including the effects of price changes on wages and the purchabing power of the peso. It likewise generates occupational wage data in the various industries.

EO 111 strengthens trade unionism by abolishing provisions in the Labor Code which limit the workers rights and hinder them from bargaining collectively with their employers. In essence, the law which strictly pursues the one-union-one-industry folicy was repealed. Likewise, reduced the required percentage for union registration was from 30 to 20 percent while the two-thirds strike vote requirement was revised to a simple majority vote. The EO also allows unions to ignore the 15 -day cooling-off period In case of union busting, and orders the military and the police forces to keep out of the picket lines in cases of strikes. Moreover, LOI 1458 which allowe management to replace striking workers who defy return to work orders was repealed.

EO No. 807 issued in 1987 established the Uccupational Safety and Health Center (OSHC) under the supervision of the Employee s Compensation Commission in order to upgrade the capability of the govermment to eliminate or reduce workrelated injuries, illnesses and deathr.

Dept. Order No. 16-A Series of 1987 provides for the creation of a Tripartite Review Committee that will study the existing labor relations provisions of the Labor Code, with the view of determining changes and improvements on the laws which gan be recommended to the President and to congress to bring about the effective promotion of industrial peace, bocial fustice and national recovery.

BLR-DOLE also launched projects euch as the UP-IIR/DTI Promotion of Harmonious Industrial Relatione Project (PHIR) and the Labor Education Frogram (LEP). The former has the promotes industrial peace through the implementation of activities that support preventive efforts and enhance cooperation between labor and management. The latter aims to provide information on labor laws, pollcies, rules and regulations, to labor and management through dialogues and seminars.

### 4.6.2. Job Creating Programe

Some specific programs to create employment opportunities include the following:
a. National Reconciliation and Development Program (NRDP)

The NRDP was establiehed to coordinate and integrate the programs, projects and other efforts of all government and non-governmental organizations towarde national reconciliation. Legal, technical, financial and educational aseistance is provided to rebel returnees for them to be able to engage in economio activitiea by finding productive employment or becoming selfmemployed.

It involves 15,291 insurgency affected barangays and at least 5000 of the regular armed members of the ingurgency movement. Local jobe are provided through the CEDP projects whereas the processing of overseas job applications are facilitated by POEA.

The other NRDP frogram components include the Rebel Returnees Livelihood Assistance Financing Froram of DTI which extende loars to finance small ecale business like bakery, basket weaving; dresemaking, tailoring and other related single proprietorship and income-generating activities.

## b. Tulong sa Tao (TST) Employment Creation Program

Under the auspices of the Bureau of Small and Medium Induetries of the DTI (BSMI-DTI) and accredited financial institutions, the TST Program is designed to increase employment opportunities and income in the rural areas, TST offers financial and technical assistance to micro entrepreneurs, government retirees, and ex-detainees to expand or start livelihood projects as well as to potential contractori and eubcontractors on machinery acquisition or transaction financing.
c. Movement for People's Livelihood and Welfare (MPLW) Program

The objective of this program is to promote livelihood or eelf-employment opportunities in the rural areas.
d. Self-Employment and Entrepreneurial Development (SEED) Program

This program offers training on self-employment and entrepreneurehip for the unemployed and idle familles of overseas workers.

An inter-agency committee on enployment programs monitoring (IAC-EPM) was set up at the Department of Labor and Employment. (DOLE) in early 1989 to monitor the various employment programs.

### 4.7. Regional Dispersal of Industries

The government's objective and strategy in the regional dispersal of industries are spelled out in the Medium Term Philippine Development Plan 1987-1992 as follows:

The dispersal of industries to the regions ehall be pursued to create employment and income opportunities in the countryeide and to slow down rural out-migration. Towards thie end, emphasie shall be given to labor-intensive, rural-based industries that are coneistent with the region's natural and human rebources. Speoifically, the development of micro, cottage, small and medium recource-oriented and agrobased types of industries shall be supported.

Efforts.in industrial dispersal shell focus on the promotion of rural credit, the celective decentralization of government services to facilitate administrative processes and procedures, and the provision of better and mofe reliable induatrial support services such as infrastructure, access to markets and technology, product development and shills urgrading.

Among the major instruments for industrial dispersal are: (1) fiscal incentives; (2) development of industrial estates and export proceseing zones; (3) credit and financial policies, particularly those supporting small and medium scale induatry development; and (4) zoning regulations. While infrastructure expenditure policy has been recognized as a potentially effective tool. for the regional diepersal of induetries. this has not been pureued actively (Fante and Medalla, 1990).

### 4.7.1. Fiscal Incentives

a. The use of fiscal incentives to promote industrial dispersal started in 1973 with the amended Export Incentives Act (FD 6135 as emended). A registered export producer whose plant is located in a BOIdesignated area obtains additional incentives such as: (1) Increased deduction from taxable income by doubling its direct labor costs up to 25.0.percent of export revenues; (2) a tax credit equivalent to 100 percent of the cost of such necessary infrastructure facilities as portworks, waterworks and roads put up by the export producer.
b. BP44, the "Investment Promotions Act for Lese Developed Areas," was enacted in 1979 under which all BOI-registered enterprises locating in BOI-designated "less developed areas" could avall of all incentives previously granted only to pioneer enterprises, except the exemption from sales tax payment.
o. The Omnibus Investments Code of 1987 provided fiscal incentives for industrial dispersal. The incentives available under BP 44 were combined with those provided for in the 1973 Export Incentives Act, 1.e., tax deduction of up to 100 percent of the cost of necessary and major infrastructure worke undertaken by the investor.

### 4.7.2. Development of Industrial Estates (IEs) and Export Processing Zones (EPZs)

One of the mechaniems utilized by the government to promote the regional dispersal of industries is the development of induetrial eetates and export proceseing zones. Export processing zones under the Export Processing Zone Authority (EPZA) were provided with a host of fiscal incentives including: (1) exemption from customs duties and internal taxes of capitalequipment, raw materials and supplies, local taxes and licenses, except. real estate taxes, contractor's tax, wharfage dues and export tax; (2) deduction of labor training expenses, organizational and pre-operating expenses; (3) tax credit on takes paid on supplies and raw materials; and (4) net operating loss carry-over and accelerated depreciation.

Past studies of the performance of EFZe and IEs in the Philippines (COWIConsult 1983; Louis Berger Internationel, Inc. 1986) concluded that on the whole, these policies have been underutilized and have not been effective instruments in the regional dispersal of industries. Moreover, the EPZs and IEs have been concentrated within the periphery of Metro Manila. The IE program has also been characterized by deficiencies in the institutional set-up, exemplified by the multiplicity of agencies involved in IE development and by lack of coordination among them.

### 4.7.3. Credit and Finanoial Polioies

The majority of the special government credit programs were aimed at promoting the development of small and medium scale enterprises. The same credit programs were utilized to provide credit support for the regional dispersal of Industries. For istance, the Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP) financed SMIs in a massive scale starting 1973. It sives priority to activities that are exportoriented, import subatitutes; labor-intensive, and largely dependent on locally produced raw materiale and to projecte located in the rural areas. Financial asbitance is granted to individuals, parnerehip and corporations with capitalization of at least $60 \%$ by Filipino citizens, engaged or intending to engage in preferred industrial projects. Assistance is given in the form of etralght peso loans; foreign currency loans under the IBRD credit line; gaurantees to peso and foreign currency loans extended by other financial institutions; and equity investments,: either In common stocks or preferred shares of firme. Financing is extended to projects which are in line with the national investment priorities, preference being accorded to projects registered with the BOI under the Investment Incentives Act or the Export Incentive Act.

In 1975, the government directed the DBP and the Industrial Guarantee and Loan Fund (IGLF) to channel 60:0. percent of their loan portfollos to areas outside Metro Manila. The following year, the $C B$ required commercial banks and thrift banks to invest 75.0 percent of the total deposits of their branches in the areas where these were located.

The lending programs, however, have not been effective in encouraging the regional dispersal of industries (Tecson, et al, 1989). There was heavy concentration of special
lending operations in Metro Manila and adjoining Regions III and IV, for a number of reasons such as: (1) centralization of the credit decisionmaking process in the head offices of participating institutions; (2) almost exclusive reliance, particularly in the case of IGLF, on accredited commercial banks whose branches are generaliy located in cities and whose head offices are usually in Metro Manila, as conduit of funds; and (3) lack of information on the availability of epecial credit programe, partioularly in the remote regions of the country (Pante and Medalla, 1990).

### 4.7.4: Zoning Regulations

Zoning is a more direct way of addressing the problem . of overconcentration of induetry in a particular area. In December 1973, the government banned the establishment of all new plants and factories within a $50-\mathrm{kilometer}$ radius of Metro Manila. In order to implement this directive, all new industrial projects were required to secure a locational clearance from the Human Settlements Fegulatory Commission (HSRC). Subsequently, the Commission formulated and iseued a comprehensive zoning ordinance which formed the basis for the zonal plan in Metro Manila. However, due to weak enforcement characterized by the liberal grant of exemptions and grace periods, the zoning regulatione did not work (Pante and Medalla, 1990).

New strategies and measures have recently been considered to facilitate the regional dispersal of industries. The DTI has proposed an industrial diepersal program involving the development of identified alternative industrial locations outeide of Metro Manila into.attractive and viable industrial centers. The developmental activities in the identified areas consist of "(1) decentralization and strengthening of trade and industryrelated services and facilities; (2) improvement of infrastructure facilities, utilities and credit delivery system; and (3) adoption of a more competitive and rational pricing of trensport and utilities."

According to DTI, priority in the program implementation shall be accorded to alties/municipalities with strong industrial potential and with fairly developed infrastructure and utilities. More specifically, DTI's set of criteria for the selection of industrial centers is composed of seven factors, namely (1) market size, including the export market; (2) availability of labor;
(3) manufacturing base; (4) búsiness services; (5) sooial amenities; (6) infrastructure and utilities; (7) other considerations such as avallability of raw materials, peace and order situation, distinct comparative advantage, and business dynamism in the locality.

### 4.7.6. Kalakalan 20

On December 14, 1989, Republic Act No. 6810 establishing the Magna Carta for Countryeide and Barangay Business Enterprises otherwise known as "Kalakalan 20" wias edgned into law by President Aquino. It provides that all Countryside and Barangay Business Enterprises . (CBBEs), defined as those whose employees do not exceed 20 , with assets not exceeding 7500,000 before financing, and iocated in the "countryside", shall be exempted from local and national taxes, license and building permit fees and other bueiness taxes, except real property and capital gains taxes, import duties and other taxes on imported articles. They shall also be exempt from any and all government rules and regulations covering assets, income, and other activities connected with the business of the enterprise. These exemptions are applicable for a period not exceeding five years from the date of registration of the CBBE. The CBBE, however, shall pay a registration fee of 7250.00 and some form of a licence fee starting on the second year of operations which ranges from $\$ 1,000$ to 75,000 per annum depending on the net aseets before financing.


#### Abstract

To promote the regional dispersal of industries, measures should be made to mitigate or remove the major constraints (such as provision of basic infrastructure and accese to credit) faced by the enterprises in the regions. Also, policies on regional dispersal of induetries should not be considered separately from the overall economic development strategy of the country.


4.7.6. Program for the Development of Small and Medium-
Scale Induatries

One of development the goals of the government has been the The role of general and of small and medium-scale industries (SMIs). SMIs can be been in $j o b$ creation, oreating entrepreneurial skills, in the regional
diepereal of industries, and in lessening to some extent the problem of income inequality. However, the major distortions which created biases against the SMIs were induced by trade policies especially foreign exchange and import controls as well as investment incentives policies particularly the complex rules and procedures which were outside the reach of SMIs. Likewise, the major export promotion programs have created some biases against SMIs due to eimilar complexitiee in rules and procedures (Pante and Medalla, 1990).

In view of such built-in policy biases against. SMIs financial and technical assistance programs have been implemented by the government to spur SMI development.

Designed for cottage, small and medium scale enterprises, the financial aseistance programs were intended to serve as a lending and/or guarantee mechanim. As a lending mechanism, the more important programs include the Industrial Guarantee and Loan Fund (IGLF), The Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP) SMILE Progrem (Small and Medium Industries Lending), and the various programe under the Technology and Livelihood Reaource Center (TLRC).

The IGLF is a revolving fund administered by the CB to cater to the financing needs for working capital and acquisition of fixed assete of SMIs. A special feature of the IGLF. program is the relaxation of the collateral requirements for borrowers with insufficient collaterals. Banks can lend to these borrowers at a minimum collateral because the IGLF shoulders up to $80 \%$ of the ultimate lose which the banks may incur in case of default by the borrowers. In addition, the special time deposit program transfers a certain amount from the IGLF to a commercial, investment, development, rural or aavinge benk, in the form of special deposits to raise the amount available for making loans to their clientele.

Some of the important consideratione in evaluating projects for possible financing are the essentiality of the project, especially with reepect to its dollar-earning or dollar-saving capacity and the number of jobs that are expected to be generated.

IGLF loans were charged a maximum intereet rate of $12 \%$ per annum.

The DBP SMILE program is intenaea to orier tne wide array of DBP lending facilitiee to SMIs.

The TLRC managee six major lending programs to SMIb, namely: (1) Agro-Industrial Technology Transfer Program which was established in 1984. (2) Export-Industry Modernization Program (EIMP); (3) Enterpriee DevelopmentFunding Scheme (EDFS); (4) Purchase Order Financing Program (POFP); (5) Bagong Balikatan sa Kabuhayan Program (BSKP); and (6) Technology Utilization Financing Program (TUFP).

Under the guarantee schemes are three major programs, namely, Guarantee Fund for Small and Medium Enterpriees (GF5ME), the Export Credit Guarantee Program for Small and Medium Industries under the Philippine Export and Foreign Loan Guarantee Corporation (PHILGUARANTEE) and' the Quedan Fund.

Overall, two main weaknesses were identified by Pante and Medalla (1990) in the varlous financial assistance programs. These are the tendency to cater to the larger segment of the SMI sector and the concentration. In the NCR. Hence, they recommended a reduction in the reliance on commercial banks and greater utilization of rural banks (with improved selection process) as conduita of SMI finance and the more extensive dissemination of information on the available SMI lending programs. Technical assietance in the field was found to be quite weak and deficient.

A support mechanism in the promotion of Cottage, Small and Medium Industries (CSMIs) is the Venture Capital Concept which is an equity financing scheme jointly undertaken by govermment and private sectors organized primarily to provide capital to CSMIs (NCSO, 1985). It features no collateral. loans and risk-sharing. Other technical aseistance extended to CSMIs are tapping nontraditional sources of funds, development of technological centers and common facilities and providing effective linkages between small entrepreneurs and the rest of the businees world.

Livelihood projects launched at the barangay level to help. strengthen the CSMIs around the countryeide include the Kilusang Kabuhayen sa Kaunlaran (KKK) which is a support system to enhance the attainment of balanced agro-industrial development.

### 4.7.7. Small and Medium Enterprise Development (SMED)

A significant step taken by the then Ministry of Trade and Industry to expand the development of emall and medium industries was the launching in 1983 of the Small and Medium

Enterprises Development (SMED) Program funded by the USAID. The implementation of the $\$ 30.2 \mathrm{M}$ project initially focused on five regions of the country. (Ilocos, Cagayan Valley, Bicol Region, Western Visayas and Central Mindanao) and three major industry sectors, namely, garments, furniture and handicrafts. SMED is divided into three components: (1) Institutional Development which develops and improves the capacity of the private sector indirectly acting as condults for extension services to emall. and $\therefore$ medium enterprises; (2) Micro Enterprises Development which identifies different approaches in the solution of problems faced by micro enterpreneure; and (3) Employment and Enterprisea Folicy Research which develops the capacity of the government to obtain better information on small and medium enterprises and facilitates effective policy dialogues between the public and private sectors on issues affecting the growth and development of small and medium enterprise.

### 4.7.8. Improvement of the Rural Credit Market

rural danks were granted subsidies (e.g. tax exemption, training, etc.) and special time deposits by the government under special lending programs to enable them to gerve rural. based clientele. Supported with subsidies, the rural banking syetem grew rapidly and reached its zenith of 1,168 banks in 1981. When internal weakneases in the Philippine financial system started to emerge in 1981 and the CB inftiated a vigorous program of financial and banking reforms including the freeing of control on interest, rates, the rural banks begin to "face the vigors and discipline of the market (Dominguez, 1988). Coupled with a large amount of arrearages from agricultural loans. Rural Banks which were not ready for market competition had to close shop. By 1986, only 856 Rural Banke remained in operation.

To help these banks recover, the Rural Bank Rehabilitation Program was introduced in 1987.. The, program aims to strengthen the rural banking system through a capital build-up and conversion scheme and/or a plan of payment covering rural banks experiencing financial difficulties. The former involves the conversion of arrearages into paid-in capital of the government in the form of shares of stock issued in the name of the Land Bank of the Philippines (LBF), while the latter involves an arrangement with the CB whereby the rural bank would amortize its arrearages with the $C B$ within a period not exceeding 10 years.

## 4.8. Invertmont Inoentives

A government agency with both planning and Implementing functions, the Board of Investments, is charged with the task of accelerating the economic development of the country by restructing its induetrial pattern. Through a package of incentivea, the BOI encourages projects that will effect dispersal of industries in the rural areas, generate employment opportunities, promote labor-intensive manufactured goods for export, develop small and mediumscale industries and increase the utilization of indigenous raw materials. These policiee are calculated to bring about long run benefite to the economy in the form of foreign exchange earnings, increased export opportuinities. progressive increaee in domestic content, fuller utilization of existing facilities and development and improvement of management methods, technical know-how and marketing strategies.

The BOI annually prepares priorities plans indicating the preferred areas of economic activities considered essential to the development of the economy. Guidelines are formulated for the rationalization of industries to ensure that development of industries would not result in economic dislocation or overorowding. Among such indusries are car and motorcycle assembly, electrical appliance assembly, banana, shipbuilding, cement, textile, abaca and others.

The investment incentives extended by the government eince 1967 are presented below. Enterprise have to be registered with the BOI for them to avall of these incentives.

### 4.8.1. Investment Incentives. Act of 1967

A set of investment incentives was institutionalized with the Investment Incentives Act of 1967 or R.A. 5186 which granted incentives to firms that udertake projects in preferred areas. It likewise encouraged foreign capital to establish pioneer enterprises which would utilize substantial amount of domestic raw materials in joint venture with Filipino capital whenever this is available.

### 4.8.2. Export Incentives Act

In 1970, RA. 6135 or the Export Incentives Act was passed encouraging new exports of manufactured products as well as the utilization of excess manufacturing capacities for export, particularly those that are labor-intensive. It also grants incentives to export trading houses which collect and export the products of fragmented and dispersed exieting capacities.

### 4.8.3. Foreign Business Regulation Act.

The Foreign Business Regulation Act, R.A. 5455 of 1968 covers the entry of foreign investments in areas of businese activity not listed in either the Investment Priorities Plan or the Export Priorities Plan. Through this, the. BOI ie able to channel foreign investmente away from areas which are already adequately exploited by Filipino nationals into areas which are expected to contribute to a sound and balanced development.

### 4.8.4. Omnibus Investment Code

Presidential Decree No. 1789, also known as the Omnibus. Investment Code, was signed on January 16, 1981. to consolidate all previous investment laws, to refine and harmonize the various incentives given by the BOI, "and to effectively streamline registration and availment procedures. This was sought to be achieved by implementing four investment laws, namely: R.A. 5186 or the Investment Incentives Act, R.A. 6135 or the Export Inceritives Act, R.A. 5455 or the Foreign Business Regulation Act and P.D. 1159 or the Agricultural Investment Incentives Decree. These laws were designed to hasten the pace of industrialization and increase economic opportunities as wiell as distribute more equitably the benefits of development.

The Omnibus Investment Code was amended by the Investment. Incentives Policy Act of 1983 or Batas Pambansa 391 (BFI 391) which added two incentives under the system, namely tax credit on net value earned and tax eredit on net local content. Net value earned refers to the value of bales less cost of raw materials and components, factory supplies
and utilities (gas, fuel, electricity and water) and depreciation of capital equipment. Under the new system, all new and expaneion projects of domestic producers will be awarded annually tax credits equivalent to $5 \%$ of net value earned, for non-pioneer projects and $10 \%$ of net value earned, for pioneer projecte. Availment of this incentive is for a period of flve yeare from start of commercial operation. Unused tax credits may be deferred and utilized in subsequent yeare (not exceeding 10 years) and are transferrable only to the registered firm's domestic material/equipment supplies.

Net local content refers to the value of export sales less applicable depreciation of capital equipment and the value of imported rew materials, componente, supplies and Indigenous commodities which the BOI may exolude if they are available under clearly more favorable terms in the local market than in the international market. Theae commodities are copper concentrates, tuna (raw or frozen), logs, banana or other products of similar nature which are easily available domestically at very advantageous prices but are competitive as final export products. New expansion projects of final exporters are allowed a tax credit equivalent to $10 \%$ of net local content of export eales. The period of availment of this incentive is five years from date of registration and a furthar five-year period on an incremental basis. Like the tax credit on net value earned, unused tax credits may also be deferred and utilized in subsequent years and are also transferrable only to the registered firm's domestic raw material supplies.

Registered and existing direct export producers are aleo entitled to a tax credit equivalent to $10 \%$ of net local content of export sales for five years from date of registration, based on the increment in real terms, i.e. without inflation of each year's export sales over the average export sales during the three-year period immediately preceding the date of registration.... EO No. 226, known as the 1987 Omnibus Investment. Code superseded $B P$ 391. It replaced the tax credit equivalent to a certain percentage of net value earned and net local content provided for in the latter by the income tax holiday for a duration ranging from three to elght years. Some evidence were cited by Pante and Medalla (1990), however, showing that BF 391 was superior to E .0 .226 with regard to promotion of labor intensive and export industries.

The Omnibus Investment Code provided the following incentives to registered enterprises to the extend engaged in a preferred area of investment.
a. Income Tax Holiday

For six years from commercial operation for ploneer firms and from years for non-pioneer firme registered new firms are fully exempted from income taxes levied by the national government. Subject to guidelines prescribed by BOI, the income tax exemptions can be extended for another year in each of the following cases:

1) the project meets the prescribed ratio of capital equiptment to number of workers set by the Board;
2) utilization of indigenous raw materials at rates set by the Board;
3) the net foreign exchange savings or earnings amount to at least $\$ 500$ thousand annually during the first three years of operation.
b. For a period of three years from commercial operation, registered expanding firms are exempted from income taxes levied by the national government proportionste to their expension under such terme and conditions as the BOI may determine; provided that during the period of availment of the incentive, the firm ia not entitled to additional deduction for incremental labor expense.
c. Additional Deduction for Labor Expenze

For the firet five yeare from registration, a registered enterprise is allowed an additional deduction from the taxable income of 50 percent of the wagee corresponding to the increment in the number of skilled and unskilled workers if the project meets the prescribed ratio of capital equipment to number of workers eet by the BOI. This additional deduction is doubled if the project is loacated in less developed areas.
d. Tax and Duty Exemption or Imported Capital Equipment

Within five years from the effectivety of the Omnibus Investment Code (1987), Importations of machinery and equipment and accompanying epare parts of new and expanding registered enterprise is exempted to the extent of 100 percent of the cuetoms duties and national internal revenue tax payable thereon.

## e. Tax Credit and Domestic Capital Equipment

A tax credit equivalent to 100 percent of the value of the national internal revenue taxes and cuetome duties that would have been waived on the machinery, equipment and spare parts, had these items been imported is given to new and expanding registered enterprise which purchsese such items from a domestic manufacture.

## f. Exemption from Contractors's Tax

The registered enterprise is exempted from the payment of contrator's tax, whether national or local.
g. Simplification of Customs Procedures

Cuetome procedure for the importation of equipment, spare parts, raw materials and supplies, as well as exports of processed products by registered enterprises is simplified by the Bureau of Customs.
E.O. 226 aims to make the incentive package competitive with those offered by other ASEAN-member countries. Apparently, however, it only reinstated the capital biab of the incentive system; reduced the inducements given to. exporters vis-a-vis non-exporters; eliminated the linkage between incentive availment and performance; and had a biae in favor of larger firms.

In August 1992, the DTI reported that it will initiate moves in Congress to overhead the Omnibus Investment Code to make it more responsive to present needs. Other. investment incentives will ikkewise be reviewed in order to stimulate capital formation by introducing new forms of fiecal and non-fiecal incentives.

Under the proposed 1993 investment priorities plan(IPF) the BOI may continue granting tax incentives to expansion programs for industrial estates (MB, March 30, 1993). The proposed IPP gives preference to the registration of new projects and expansion will be limited to export-oriented projecte and those costing lese than 40 million or small amd medium scale enterprises that meet good performance criteria. The BOI will retain the five-year lag time for registered firme to bring in their importation of capital equipment instead of the planned two-year program. This is in line with the governemnt's tax and duty-free importation of capital equipment that is due to expire in 1997.

However, the government will require companies and their principal shareholders to submit a tax clearance before they could avail of government incentives and services (Manila Bulletin, June 5, 1993). This is in line with the governemnt's efforts to improve tax collectione and to deter tax evasion. Tax clearance will have to be obtained from the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) and/or the Bureau of Customs and/or any appropriate government agency to show that an enterprise is properly paying taxes to the government. This requirement will be imposed on existing companies as well as those intending to do business. Garment companies will be asked to secure tax clearance before they can avali themselves of quotas and other benefits from the Garment and Textile Export Board. (GTEB). Enterprises availing tax and duty drawbacks will be required te subnit tax clearance from the ofe stop-shop center.

Other incentives have been granted to the garments and electronics Industry. The Monetary Board has granted the garment industry partial exemption from the pre-shipment inspection of the Swise-based Societe Generale de Surveillance (SGS) (Manila Bulletin, March 24, 1993). The exemption is limited to precut febrics since these could not be diverted to the domestic market. The confederation of the Garment Exporters of the Philippines (CONGEP), through its President, however sald that the exemption of preaut fabrics serves no purpose. According to CONGEP, such importation had been concentrated from the United States in the amount of $\$ 71 \mathrm{million}$ which largely favored only one company. Shipments of precut fabrice from other countriee amount to less than $\$ 1$ miliion.

The. Monetary Board, however, is reportedly keen on allowing certain imports of the garment gector other than the precut fabrics and accessories to be exempted from the pre-shipment scheme of the SGS (Manila Bulletin, March 30, 1993). But the DTI is not yet inclined to free the entire industry's raw material importations from the pre-shipment monitoring mechanism despite the clamor of garment exporters.

The government has already exempted the electronice and semi-conductor sectors from the SGS pre-shipment inspection. The sector being a 100 percent export-oriented industry (Manila Bulletin, March 30, 1993). Thie along with the garment sector contributes the bulk of the foreign exchange earnings of the Philippines.

Under the revieed medium term Philippine Export Development Plan (PEDP) which outilnee a 19 percent annual export growth between 1993 to 1998, the country hopes to reach the $\$ 27.7$ billion export level by 1998 by pushing 14 major export groups instead of promoting exports in broad terms and distributing limited resources thinly. Under the nonfarm enterprises, those which have been identified as fast growing, short-gestating export products include carageenan and seaweeds, marble, proceseed tropical fruits, shrimps and prawns, ceramice, fumiture, garments, gifts and houseware, jewelry, electronic components and computer software.

In terms of markets, the focus will be the major exnension of blocke such as Europe, Japan and the Uniod States.

Private sector participation will be increased by setting : up a system of accountability and responsibility based on specific performance standards. The government will reorganize the Export and Investment Development Council into the Export Development Council as the central agency that will review and assess policy issues affecting the export sector (Manila Bulletin, June 7, 1993).

### 4.8.5. One Stop Action Center for Investment

This was enacted in February 1987 through E.O. 136 in order to facilitate the entry of investments and processing of investment applications. It was designed to extend assistence to local and foreign investments by providing information, advice and guidance on pertinent laws and procedures relative to foreign and local investments and the conduct of business in the Philippinee. It houees in one place all the agencies needed to deal with in the processing of investment applications such as the BOI, the Central Bank, Securities nad Exchange Commiesion (SEC), Immigration Commission, Department of Foreign Affairs, Department of Tourism, Department of Agriculture and the Export Proceseing Authority.

## 4.8.

P.D: 1851 signed in November 6, 1982 liberalizes inveetment requirements for foreigners deairing to obtain Special Investor's Resident Visa in the Philippines. The iesuance of this decree is in line with the government's long standing folicy of attracting foreign investmente to eupplement domestic resourcee.

Under this decree, foreigners willing to investment at least $\$ 200,000$ in any businees or induetrial undertaking in any part of the country may be iesued Special Investor's Resident Visas As a holder of this visa an allien is entitled to reatal in tire sinitppines winie his investmente subsists.

This decree broaden investment opportunities for potential investors. Formerly under P.D. No. 1623, such investment were limeted only to economically depressed priority areas. The opportunities avallable to foreign investors range from investments in shares of stocks on corporations to investmente in real estate euch as condominiums.

To further encourage the entry of small foreign Investors, P.D. No. 1893 signed on Dec. 13, 1983 grants Special Investor's Resident Visa to alliens willing and able to invest at least $\$ 75,000$ in the country.

Upon lesuance of the resident visa, the investor is given a special return certificate allowing multiple entries into the country, without obtaining appropriate re-entry visa, for a period of one year and renewable every year. For monitoring purposes, he is required to gubmit an annual report to prove that he has maintained hie investment in the country.

The Forelgn Investments Aesistance Center (FIAC) was established within the Board of Investments by virtue of Executive Order No. 845 to provide easy access to information and assistance to potential and existing foreign investors in the Philippines. In order to facilitate the entry and maintenance of foreign investments through the minimization of bureaucratic "red tape". and epeeding up of the processing time for applications, clearances and the like, the FIAC provides a "one-stop shop" that is equipped to handle all facets of foreign investment in the country. Executive Order No. 845 signed on November 8, 1982, empowere the FIAC to act on all matters relative to foreign investors.

Although under the adminietrative supervision of the BOI, the FIAC is authorlzed to enlist the aesietance and cooperation of any other govermment agency with which a foreign investor may have to transact business. The services of the center are provided free of charge and are available to all foreign investore upon entry into the country and throughout the maintenance of the investment in the Philippines.

### 4.10. Export Promotion Program

Aside from BOI export incentives provided under the Omnibus Investment Code, other export promotion measures aimed at providing intermediate inputs at world market prices, thereby putting exports under a "free trade" status. Tax and duty-free access to intermediate inputs is extended through outright tax and duty exemptions; or the tax and duty drawback mechanism (Pante and Medalla, 1990).

Tax and duty exemption on imported inputs may be availed by: (1).locating an export processing, zone (EPZ), (2) Using bonded manufacturing, warehouse (BMW) facilities, and (3) Importing under Customs Administrative Order 3-78 (CAO 3-78). Tax and duty drawback on imported intermediate inputs used in export production may be availed of either through individual drawback scheme of the Bureau of Custome (BOC) or fixed drawback scheme of the BOI.

Other programe being undertaken by the government through the Bureau of Small and Medium Industries are: 1) the Export Development Program of DTI, CB and the Department of Finance which assists emall and medium scale exporters of priority products, like garmente; gifts and houseware, food and furniture; 2) the Market. Encounter Program, which organizes buyers, shows and product development programs for the finest Philippine producte; and 3) the Exporte Assistance Network (EXPONET) which assists small and medium entrepreneurs who want to get started in exports.

### 4.11. Program for Technology Upgrading and Development

The level of technological development in the country has been observed to be poor compared to other developing countries. Among the reasons which have been cited are: lack of motivation provided by the system of industrial
protection, underutilization of R\&D results, underinvestment in R\&D development, and weak linkage between technology generators and end-users. In order to promote a higher level of technological development in the country, the follwoing measures have been proposed by Pante and Medalla (1990): (1) integration of technology policy into the national development strategy; (2) development of the country's technological manpower; (3) strengthening of, the technological infrastructure (information system, inkages, product standards, testing services, etc.); and (4) promotion of technology-enhancing activitiee (greater private sector spending for $R \& D$ and more emphasie on the dissemination of exieting teohnology, partioularly to SMIe).

## CHAPTER 5

## TREND ANALYSIS OF RURAL NONFARM ENTERPRISES

This chapter discusses the growth in rural nonfarm enterprises focusing on the number of. establishmente, output, employment, and prices. The analysis covers the period 1975 to 1989. As indicated earlier the data were obtained from the Census and Annual Survey of Eetabliehments undertaken by the National Statistics Office. The scope of the survey varied and zometimes covered both. small and large establishments but for some years only the large industries defined as establishments with 10 or more workers were surveyed. The definition of establishment also differed over the years with small ones defined as those with one or five workers for some years and one to nine workers. for other years.

Geographically, data were reported for the Philippines as a whole before 1975. Thereafter, the NSO published data for the Philippines, Metro Manila, and the various administrative regions. For purposes of the present study, rural nonfarm enterpriees (RNEs) are defined: as manufacturing establishmente located outside Metro Manila. In analyzing the trends, the distribution of number of establishments, output, and employment between Metro Manila and the rural areas is presented. The rural nonfarm enterprises were grouped into twelve industry seotors, namely: food, beverages, tobacco, textile, paper, wood, petroleum, chemicals, baeic metals, machineries, electrical, and others. The comiodity components of these industries are defined in Chapter 2.

Thus, all basic data on output, employment, and number of establishments for trend analysis in this chapter were obtained from the NSO. Where percentages are presented, these were computed also from NSO data. The implicit price indices in Fig. 5.60 ( $a$ and b) were obtained from the NSCB Statistical Yearbook:

### 5.1. Number of Establishments

Data on the number of establishments in manufacturing industries are available only for the period 1975 to 1983 and 1988 to 1989. The total number of all establishments for the country as a whole grew from 77,291 in 1975 to 85,310 in 1980 but went down to 77,805 in 1989. Most of these establishments have less than ten workers. These smell
industries comprised 92 percent of all establishments in 1975 and 87 pericent in 1989. Geographically, about one fifth of the estblishments are located in Metro Manila and four fifthe in the regions outside the metropolis (Fig. 5.1) Over the period under study, the distribution of establishments between Metro Manila and the rural areas did not vary very much and changed only from 79.4 percent in the rural areas in 197.6 to 81.8 percent in 1978 and 1979. In 1988 and. 1989, 80 . percent of the estabilishments are located in the rural areas.

Focusing on the rural nonfarm enterprises, 47 percent of the number of establishments were engaged in food manufacturing in 1989 (Fig. 5.2 in 2 partg). During the seme year, the second largest coneentration was in the textile industry which: eccounted for-20.8 percent of all establishments. This was followed by machineries with 10.73 percent and wood with 10.02 percent. The group called "other" manufacturing industries constitutes 6.54 percent of the total number of establishments. The rest are in paper, beverage, chemicals, basic metals, electrical, tobacco; and petroleum industries. in that order. Over time; the percentage distribution among industry groups has not changed very much except a decline in the percentage of textile induetries between 1983 and 1988 and an increase in food industries during these same years. The year 1983 is a census year and the number of establishment data may not be comparable with the annual data.

During the period 1975 to 1982 and 1988 to 1989, the total number of establishmente in the manufacturing sector in the rural areas did not differ much and ranged only from 62.3 thousand in 1976 and 1989 to 69.7 thousand in 1978. The total number of rural establishnents increased from 62.7 thousand in 1975 to 69.7 thousand in 1981 after which it declined and reached only 62.3 thousand in 1989 which is even slightly lower than the number in 1975. Excluding the year 1983, the number of food establishmente in the rural areas ranged from 23.2 thoueand in 1975 to 29.8 thousand in $1988^{\circ}$.

The number of firms in the beverage industry remained practically the same between 1976 and 1982 but went down elightly in 1988 and 1989. The tobacco and petroleum industries had the least nymber of firms among the RNEs. It is worth noting that from 1976 to 1983 , the number of firms in the tobacco industry was almost the eame, 10 to 12 firms.

The textile Industry had the eecond largest number of firms averaging about 26,080 between 1976 and 1982. However, this number went down to 13,130 in 1988 and then 12,981 in 1989.

Fig. 5. I_Percentage Dlstribution of Number of
Esiablishments Between Rural and Metro Manila, in Selected Years
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For the period 1975 to 1982, the number of establishments in the wood and chemical industries varied from 3.7 thousand to 4.8 thousand and from 274, to 866 , respectively. The number of wood establishments went up by about 2000 in the late 1980 s but that of wood declined by about 300.

On the relative proportion of the number of firms between Metro Manila and the rural areas, 78 to 81 percent are located in the latter. Figures 5.3 to 5.14 show the distribution of firms between the two areas for each industry sector. A large proportion of the establishments in the food, beverage, textile, wood, machinery, and other industries is located in the rural areas. Looking at the period 1976 to 1982 and 1988 to 1989 , 89 to 92 peroent of the food manufacturing esteingehmente are in the mural areas. The corresponding proportions for the other industries are: 96 to 98 percent for beverages; 71 to 79 percent for textile; 73 to 84 percent for wood; 68 to 76 percent for machineries; and 83 to 86 percent for others.

On the other hand, the tobacco, paper, basic metale, and electrical industries have relatively more establishments in Metro Manila than in the rural areas. Only about 23 to 30 oercent of tobacco manufacturing firme were In the rural areas in the second half of the 1970 e to the early 1980s, however, in the late $1980 s$ this proportion has increased to about 50 percent.

The number of establishments by size is available for five yeare and the distibution of RNEs by size is shown in Figure 5.15. Note the very high proportion of small establishments, that 1s, those with one to nine workers, in the rural areas. About 90 to 95 percent of the RNEs are small establishments. It seems, however, that the proportion of small RNE establishments 1s. decining. In 1975, 95 percent of the firms were emall; this proportion went down to 94 percent in 1978, to 93 percent in 1983, and to 92 percent in 1989

Although still predominantly mall, Metro manifa nas a smaller proportion of smell establishments. About two-thirds of the Metro Manila manufacturing firms in 1981 were small. Only 32 percent has 10 or more workers. Like those in the rural areas; the proportion of small firms seems to be going -down. The percentage of small firms in 1977 was 77 percent which is higher compared with the 74 percent in 1983 and the 68 percent in 1989. Thus, approximately one third of the Metro'Manila manufacturing establishments in 1989 are large firms.
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Fig. 5-15Percentage Distribution of Number od Establishment of RNEs, by Size, in Selected Years
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For the Philippines as a whole, 87 percent of the manufacturing estabiishments in 1989 is. small while the corresponding percentage in 1977 was 92 percent.

By industry, the percentage distribution of rural nonfarm enterprises by size is presented in Figures 5.16 to 5.27. Dominated by small firms are the following industries: food, beverage, textile, wood, paper, chemicals, machineriee, and others. In particular, 92 to 95 percent of food establishments in the rural areas are small. In contrast, all tobacco firms in the rural areas in 1989 were large. Petroleum establishments are also large; so with electrical firms. The trend in the size of basic. metals firms is such that all establishments were large up to the early 1980 s but the proportion has gone down to 44 percent in 1989.

### 5.2. Gross Value Added from Rural Nonfarm Enterprises

In the estimation of the submodel equations for rural nonfarm enterprises, gross value added (GVA) was used in the demand and employment functions. GVA as estimated by the NEDA represents aggregate values, that is, it is not subdivided between Metro Manila and the regions outside the metropolitan area. The NSO survey of establishments contains data on total output by region. The proportion of total output in each of the two areas for each of the twelve industry sectors therefore was applied: to GVA from manufacturing to obtain the GVA from the RNEs.

Considering the years 1975 to 1989 , about 45 to 58 percent of the total output came from the rural enterpribes and 42 to 55 percent from-Metro Manila establishments. There was not much difference then between the contribution of the establishments in Metro Manila and that of the establishments in the rural areas to total output. It can be obeerved though that in all the years except the three years from 1977 to 1979, the output in the rural area was alwaye higher than that in Metro Manila (Fig. 5.28). The share of Metro Manila to total output was highest at 55.12 percent in 1978 and lowest at 42.11 percent in 1985. The contribution of rural industries ranged from 44.88 percent in 1978 to 57.89 percent in 1985.

Figures 5.29 to 5.40 show the relative contribution of Metro Manila and rural enterprises to total manufacturing. It was only in 1983 wherein the output of the food industry In Metro Manial was higher than that in the rural areas (Fig. 5.29). The difference, however, was :' quite







Fig. 5.28 . Percentage Output in Rural
Areas and Metro Manila, 1975-89


R需 Rural Areas Metro Manila

Flo. 5. 29 Peroenlage Outpul in
Food Induitrice in Rural Arone and Meifo Manila, 1070-80


Fig.5. 30 Percentide Oulpui In Beverage Induetrlea In Rural Arena and Melro Manila, 1076-60


Riin Rural Areas $\AA$ IITW Metro Manlla

Flg 5 青 Pereentege Oulpul in
Tobecco Induetries in Rural Areae and Metro Menila, 1076-60


Flg 532 percenlage Output In
Texille Industrias In Rural Areanand Motro Maniln, 10t 6-80


4-i Rural Areas ADHW Motro Manila

Fia 5.33.Peroentege Outpul in Wood Induifiriep in Rural Arene and Molro Manila, 1076-80


Hici RuraL Areas Mlive Metro Manila

Fig 5 234.Percenlage Oulput in
Paper Induetrlea in Rural Aront and Metro Manlia, 1076-89


E: Rural Aroas KIIIV Metro Manlla

Fig. 535 Peroentape Oulpul In
Cheralcal Indusiries In Rural Areate and Motro Manlim, 1975-1980


Rural Areas NTW Metro Manile

FIg.5.36percentage Output In
Folroleum Industrios In Rural Areat and Metro Manlle, 1076-80


Rural Areas



Fig:53.Parontege Oulpul In Elecirienl Induelriee in Rural Arease and Melro Manile, 1976-80


Flo. 40 Percenlage Output in Other Induetrlos In Mural Areas and Molro Manila, 1076-80


Fin Aural Areas MilV Motro Manlla

Insignificant. During the year, Metro Manila produced 50.07 percent of total output compared to the 49.93 percent shere of the food industry in the rural areas. The lowest contribution of Metro Manila and the highest for the tural areas at 33.52 percent and 66.48 percent, respectively were noted in 1988.

There was a generally increasing trend in the share of the rural areas in the output of the beverage indugtry particularly from 1981 to 1989 (Fig. 5.30). The relative proportion of the share of the rural areas to total output went up from 37.68 percent in 1977 to a high of 70.79 percent in 1989. The opposite was true for Metro Manila. The latter's share in the total output of the beverage induetry declined to only 29.21 percent in 1989 from 62.32 percent in 1977.

Tobacco manufacturing was concentrated in Metro Manila with a total output share of 93.51 percent in 1975 to 97.99 percent in 1984 (Fig. 5.31). The difference of 2.01 to 6.49 percent in the output was provided by the tobacco industrial establishments in the rural areas.

A large proportion of the total output of the textile industry cane from Metro Manila from 60.72 percent in 1979 to 74.72 percent in 1975 (Fig. 5.32). The rest was produced in the rural areas.

Unlike the textile industry, most of the output of the wood industry was obtained from the rural areas. Of the total industry output, 71.40 percent (in 1979) to 81.10 percent (in 1984) were produced by firme outside of Metro Manila (Fig. 5.33).

Except for the years 1976 to 1986, the share of the Metro Manila paper industry to total output was always higher than that in the rural areas, from 54.41 percent percent in 1983 to 78.24 percent in 1975 (Fig. 5.34). In 1976 and 1986, Metro Manila contributed only 49.04 percent and 49.33 percent, respectively to the total output of the paper industry.

The share of the chemical industries in the rural areas to the total ohemical output was always lower than that of Metro Manila fluctuating from 8.94 percent in 1975 to 33.99 percent in 1986 (Fig. 5.35).

Among the twelve industries,
industry which had the highest concentration of output coming from the rural areas. Almost all its output from 1975 to 1989 came from the RNEs with high percentage shares of $98.15^{\circ}$ percent to 99.89 percent (Fig. 5.36). Metro Manila contributed less than two percent to total output.

For the years 1975 to 1983, the output of the basic metal industries in the rural areas was lower compared to that in Metro Manila, ranging from 25.82 percent in 1977 to 47.66 percent in 1983 (Fig. 5.37). From 1984 to 1989, the reverse was observed with the basic metal industries in the rural areas contributing more to total output than those in Metro Manila with the highest of 73.43 percent in 1986.

The output of the machinery and electrical industries in the rural areas was always lower than those in Metro Manila (Fig. 5.38 and 5.39). The ehare of the machinery industry varied from 17.04 percent in 1977 to 42.35 percent in 1975 while that of the electrical induetry fluctuated from a very low 2.93 percent in 1977 to 41.92 percent in 1987.

It should be pointed out that the electrical industry contributed very little to total RNE output in the 1970 B and early 1980s, however, the reverse trend was quite noticeable in the latter half of the 1980s. In fact, the Philippines has become a large exporter of electrical products which are now. one of the principal nontraditional exports of the country.

The other manufacturing induetries had more output in the rural areas than in Metro Manila (Fig. 5.40). The share of the former to total output was lowest in 1979 at. 52.54 percent and highest in 1976 at 75.98 percent. The contribution of the latter wae in the range of only 24.02 to 47.46 percent.

- In summary, the tobacco, textile, paper, chemical, machinery, and electrical industries produced higher quantities of output in Metro Manila. The rural areas contributed more to total output in the food, wood, petroleum and other nanufacturing industries. The beverage and the basic metal industries exhibited an increasing concentration of output in the rural areas. During the first half of the 15 -year period from 1975 to 1989 , more of the output of the two industries came from Metro Manila. In the eecond half of the period, the rural areas eupplied greater amounts of beverage and basic metale.

Figure 5.41 preeents the trend in GVA from all rural enterprises from 1975 to 1989. GVA increased from P8.5 billion in 1975 to $P 14.4$ billion in 1989 representing an annual growth rate of 3.55 percent.

Figure 5.42 (in 2 parts) show the cumulative percentage distribution of total output in RNEs. Like the food industry, the output of the petroleun industry comprised a big portion of the total RNE output. Adding the outputs of
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the food Industry and petroleum industry gave a percentage share as high as 64.72 percent in 1982. The lowest combined share of 44.46 percent took place in 1978. The further addition of each of the percentage shares of the beverage, machinery, wood and textile industries created more or less similar trends, declining from 1975 to 1978 , then increasing until 1982, and declining again in general until 1989. The highest cumulative share was pbtained in 1975 and 1982. Adding up the contribution to the total output of the basic metal industries resulted in total percentage ghares ranging from 75.70 percent in 1978 to 87.16 percent in 1982.

The vertical difference between any two lines in Figure 5.42 shows the percentage contribution of each industry. Thus petroleum had the largest contribution to total RNE
 largest contribution was made by the food industry which accounted for more than one-fourth of the total RNE output during the period. The food industry made the highest share of 32 percent in 1979. In 1989, its share amounted to 28.17 percent of total RNE output.

Next to food and petroleum, the four industries that made relatively large contribution to total. RNE output in 1989 were basic metale, 10.09 percent; beverage, 8.95 percent; chemicals, 6.74 percent; and textile, 6.62 percent. These were followed by other manufacturing which contributed 5.26 percent and then wood industries, 5.21 percent.

Figure 5.43 (in 3 parts) shows the trend in the grose value added of RNEs from each industry group. As indicated above, the two industries which contributed the moet to the gross value added from RNEs were the food and petroleum industries. The value added from food rose from P4.01 billion in 1975 to 56.56 billion in 1989 or an annual growth rate of 3.33 percent for the period 1975 to 1989 . The value added from the petroleum industry was more or lese etable with a narrow range from P1. 15 billion in 1985 and 1986 to P1.40 billion in 1989.

The tobacco industry had the lowest value adaed among the RNE sectors. For the period 1976 to 1989, its value added fluctuated between P17 million and P51 million. The gross value added from the electrical industry exhibited an increeasing trend from P20.63 million in 1977 to P838.40 million in 1987, a very high growth rate of about 96 percent per year. Mild fluctuations were noted in the grose value added from the paper induetry in contrast to the large variations in the value added from the chemical industry. The gross value added from the paper and chemical industries varied from P103.8 million in 1975 to $F 386.53$ million in 1989 and from P159.76 million in 1975 to P760.36 million in 1980, respectively.

Fig. 5 . 43 a.-Trend in Gross Value Added from RNEs, by Industry Group, 1975-1:389
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An increaeing trend for the grose value added coming from the beverage industry, a somewhat declining trend for the machinery industry, a fluctuating pattern for the textile industry, and an overall fluctuating pattern but with rising value added from 1985 to 1989 for the other industries can be observed in Figure 5.43. The value added ranged from $\mathbf{~} 236.99 \mathrm{million}$ in 1976 to P 663.3 million in 1989 for the beverage induatry; $P 405.74 \mathrm{milli}$ on in 1975 to P882.79 million in 1984 for the textile industry. A Bhare decline in output in the textile industry occurred from 1984 to 1985, however, this has recovered so the value added in 1989 reached a level of P 879.03 million . For the basic metal industry, the GVA was quite variable from 1975 to 1982. It went up continuously, however, from P685.16 million in 1982 to P 1673.82 million in 1989 . As regards the wood induetry, the gross value added tnereased from 1875 to : 1980 but showed a generally declining trend until 1986 after which it picked up again reaching a level of 9490 million in 1989.

### 5.3. Employment

The manufacturing induetiry employed more than 1.2 million people in 1989 about 50 percent of whom were in rural enterprises and the other half in Metro Manila. The trend in the percentage distribution of employment followed almost a similar pattern as that of total output. The total number of workere was almost equally divided between the rural areas and Metro Manila especially from 1977 to 1981 (Fig. 5.44) But rural nonfarm enterprises seem to absorb more employment in the 1980s.

Figures. 5.45 to 5.56 show the percentage labor absorption of each of the twelve induetry sectors from 1975 to 1989. Juring the period, the food, beverage, wood, and petroleum industries in the rural areas employed more workers than those located in Metro Manila. The food industry is mainly rural in terms of the proportion of labor employed which is about three fourthe of total employment within the industry. For the beverage industry, about twothirds of the laborers are working in beverage firme located in the rural areas. The wood and petroleum industries have a large proportion of workers in the rural areas - about 66.92 percent and 88.52 percent respectively in 1989.

More people were employed in Metro Manila s tobacco, paper, chemical, and electrical industries than in the same types of enterprises in the rural areas. The percentage share, however, of employment in the electrical industry

Fig. 5. 2 . Percentage Employment in Rural Areas and Metro Manila, 1975-89


Fig. 545. Porceniage Employment in Food Industries in Rural Areas and Molro Manila, 1975-80


FIg. 546 Paroentege Emplayment in Beverage Industries In Rural Areat and Melro Manlla, 1075-86


Rural Areas Motro Manila

Flg. 5.17. Peroenlage Employment In Tobacco Industrioe In Nural Areat ard Motro Manila, 1978-80


FIg. 5.18 Porcentage Employment In Toxille Induatrios In Rural Aresa and Moiro Mnnlln, 1975-80


Rex Rutal Areas IIVIV Metro Manlla

Fig. 5. 49 Peroeniape Employment in Wood Induetries in Rurwl Arewe and Metro Menlla, 1976-60


Fig. 5. 50 Perountage Employment In Paper Induatrion In Rural Arese and Melro Manlla. 1976-80


Flo. 5.51 Peronnitage Employment In Baiale Mot. Induelrios in fural Areas and Melro Manlla, 1976-6日


Fig. 5.52 Percentags Employment in Mach Induatrieo In Rural Aroac and Motro Manila, 1976-69


Flo.5.53 Peroentiage Employment in Chemical Induefriee in Rural Arete and Melro Manlla, 1975-80


FIg. 5.54 porcentage Employment fin petromum indusities in Rural neese and Motro Menila, 1975-89


Flo. 5.55 Perceninge Employment In Elacirical Indus irioe in Rural Areas and Meiro Manlla, 1976-80


Fig. 5. In Percentage Employment in oitiof Tindusiries In Rural Arese and Molro Manila, 1975-00

appeared to be decreabing from 97.15 percent in 1977 to 73.96 percent in 1987 . No definite trends could be discerned from the percentage shares of the other three industries. The share in employment of the tobacco industiry varied from 74.08 percent in 1985 to 93.45 percent in 1979; 63.15 percent in 1983 to 74.13 percent in 1978 for the paper industry; and 71.41 percent in 1983 to 84.98 percent. in 1978 for the chemical industry.

For the rest of the manufacturing industries euch as the textile, basic metal, and machinery induetries, although. in general, the percentage shares of employment in Metro Manila were higher than in the rural areas, there were one or two years in the 15 -year period covered by the study wherein more people were employed in the latter. In the textile industry, 50.38 per cent in 1977 and 51.11 percent In 1978 had jobs in the rural areas. In the baeic. metal industry, 52.45 percent and 51.37 percent respectively in 1985 and 1986 got employed in the rural areas. The machinery industry generated only 49.72 percent of the total employment in Metro Manila in 1987.

The highest percentage employment in Metro Manila for the textile, basic metal, and machinery industries were 66.06 percent in $1989,81.74$ in 1975 , and 70.34 percent in 1977, respectively. The percentage employment in the basic metal industry in Metro Manila exhibited a declining trend.

The percentage employment in the other induetriee in Metro Manila fluctuated from 39.88 percent in 1988 to 52.95 percent in. 1979. Orily in five of the 15 year period did the labor force in Metro Manila beoame greater than that in the rural areas. These years were 1976 to 1979 and 1982.

Rural nonfarm enterprises employed 391.27 thoueand people in 1975. Between that year and 1989 the general trend in labor absorption by RNEs ie increasing at an amual rate of 2.92 percent (Fig. 5.57). (Note the sharp increase in employment from 1977 to 1978 which was followed by a sharp decline the following year. These changes are difficult to explain. The year 1978 is a ceneus year while. 1977 and 1979 are years when the regular annual surveys were conducted. It 18 possible that there was a change in measurement and the data for 1978 may noy be comparable or consietent with the other data in the series. ) Nevertheless, employment was on the uptrend, a drop was observed from 1981 to 1984 after which the nember of workers in RNEs increased steadily. For the period 1984 to 1989, total employment by RNEs arew at a rate of 5.13 percent per annum.

Fig. 5.57. Trend in Employment in All RNE 8 , 1975-1989


The distribution of employment among the different sectors is presented in Figure 5.58 (in 2 parts). Among the RNEs, the food industry employed the most number of pereons. In 1989, the sector absorbed about 35.39 percent of all manufacturing workeirs in 1989. In terms of employment generation, the food industry was followed by the textile industry and then by the wood industry, which absorbed about 19.46 percent and 15.66 percent of the total labor force in the manufacturing sector. These industries, together with machinery, beverage, and other industries account for 83.11 percent of all employment in manufacturing in 1989.

For the period 1975 to 1989; the food industry employed the greatest number of pereons among all RNEs (except. in 1978 which as indicated earlier was a census year and data may noy be comparable with other years.) The labor force in the food industry generally increased from 129 thousand in 1976 to 221 thousand in 1989 (Fig. $5.59 \mathrm{a}-5.59 \mathrm{c}$ ). Second to the food industry in terms of creating jobs was the textile induetry, followed by the wood induetry:

The fourth, fifth and seventh manufacturing industries in terms of providing jobe in the rural areas were. the machinery, other industries, and the chemical industry, respectively (Fig. $5.59 b$ ). The employment generated by the machinery induetry fluctuated and ranged from 26 thousand in 1977 to 43 thousand in 1978. The chemical and the other manufacturing industries exhibited somewhat increasing trends from 10 thousand in 1975 to 22 thousand in 1988, and from 20 thousand in 1975 to 40,551 in 1988 , respectively. The other industries, however, had 1te highest employment of 40,779 people in 1978.

The electrical industry's participation in the labor force increased from a very low 1,022 pereons: (the loweat among all the RNEs in 1975) to 15 thousand in 1989; that of the basic metal industry varied from two thousand in 1975 to 10 thousand in 1985. Of all the RNEs , the petroleum industry had the lowest generated employment with a very narrow range (fron 1,127 in 1976 to. 3,069 in 1982).

Fig. 5.59 e shows the trend in employment in the beverage, paper and tobacco industries. The eixth induetry with the largest labor force participation in the rural areas was the beverage industry. Employment in this industry went up from 13 thousand in 1976 to 22 thousand in 1989. Although the size of the labor force in the paper industry varied through the years, it grew from nine thoueand feople in 1975 to 14 thoueand in 1989. Compared to the petroleum induetry, the labor force in the tobacco industry was $a$ little bit greater.
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Fig.5.59a Trend in Employment In RNEs by Industry, 1975-1989


Flg.59. Trend in Employment in RNEs by Industry, 1975-1989


Fig. 5.59 c . Trend in Employment in RNEs by Industry, 1975-1989


### 5.4. Prioen

Figures 5.60a and 5.60b show the behavior of prices from 1975 to 1989. Regardless of industry group, prices are on the uptrend. Prices went upward steadily for the whole period but the rate of increase seemed to have moved faster after the 1983 crisis.

### 5.5. Some Concluding Remarks

Several tables and figures show surprisingly little change in total number of firms, share of output, or distribution between rural/urban and small/large firms over time. Dreta were obtained from the NSO and there is no way by which the accuracy of the data could be checked. The NSO publishes two surveys of manufactures, one is the annual survey and the other is the census of manufactures and there are some differences in the two sets of publications.

Some indicators could be obtained from the literatune (Chapter 3 and 4). For example, in the Petron, Caltex and Shell. In the paper and paper products manufacture of paper and paper producte in 1980. Based on data from PULPAPEL, there were 24 paper mills 14 of which were in Metro Manila, four in Central Luzon, two in Southern Tagalog, two in the Visayas and two in Mindanao. It would probably be difficult for the firms to move between Metro Manila and the provinces. It was further gathered that small pulp and paper mills proliferated in various parts of the country. These are located mainly outside Metro Manila and therefore would be claseified under "rural."

Another issue that should be considered is the presence of the informal/underground economy which "could be" large. However, there are no exiating time eeries data whether on the aggregate, subsector, urban/rural, and sinall/large firms. At the moment therefore, no analysis could be made. It is suggested that a survey of the informal/underground firms be made to be able to understand their operations and to analyze the possible impact of government policies.
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Fig. 5.60b. Implicit Price Index of RNE Products by Industry Group, 1976-1989


## CHAPTER 6

## SUBMODEL ESTIMATES FOR THE RURAL NONFARM ENTERPRISES

For this study, rural nonfarm enterprises (RNEs) have been defined to include those enterprises engaged in the manufacture of various goode and located in regions outside Metro Manila. The RNEs were classified into twelve sectors nameiy:
(1) Food manufacturing
(2) Beverage manufacturing
(3) Tobacco manufacturing
(4) Textile, wearing apparel, and leather induetriee
(5) Manufacture of wood and wood producte
(6) Manufacture of paper and paper products, printing and publiehing
(7) Manufacture of chemicale and chemical, rubber. and plastic producte
(8) Manufacture of petroleum and coal products
(9) Basic metal Industries
(10) Manufacture of fabricated metal products, machineriee (except electrical) and transport equipment
(1i) Manufacture of electrical machinery, apparatus, appliancee, and supplies.
(12) Other manufacturing induetriee

The structure and behavior of these RNEs were tanaycu by constructing a eubnodel which determines the levele of value added, employment and prices for each of the above 12 sectors. The eubmodel is later linked with the. PIDS NEDA macroeconometric model (MEM) to determine the effecte of various macroeconomic policies.

### 6.1 The submodel

Chapter 2 presented the theoretical and analytical framework in a submodel for the analysia of output or value added, employment and prices of rural nonfarm enterprises. The submodel consists of three major blocks, namely; demand, employment and prices.

The PIDS NEDA MEM developed by Conetantino, Yap, Butiong and de la Paz (1990) divided the production sector into the fixprice, flexprice and flexprice/flexquality sectors. The fixprice sector is assumed to have an adjusting output level and fixed prices and is most applicable to the industrial sector. Characterized by an oligopolistic structure, production adjustmente to increase In demand take place on the quantity side. Prices are like? to for fixer in the short run by feietively stable mark-ups over variable cost. Following the assumptions of the PIDS NEDA MEM, the RNE demand is assumed to depend a sector prices and to indicators of aggregate dmestic $\because$ and international demand. Output adjuste to quantity demanded due to excess capacity.

Indicators of aggregate domestic demand include private consumption expenditures, government consumption expenditures (or the summation of private and government coneumption expenditures) and population while international demand is represented by exports. The damand functions, may be expressed mathematically as follows:

where:
$Q=$ output is measured by the real grose value 1 added for each RNE sector (million pesos)

| $P$ | $=1 m p l i c i t$ price index for $G V A$ in the sector |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | $(1972=100)$ |

$\mathrm{CP}=$ private consumption expenditures (million pesos)
CG. = government consumption expenditures (million pesos)
POR $=$ population (million)
$X_{i}=$ value of exports from the sector
(million dollars,
$\mathrm{U}=$ error term
$i$

Traditional neoclaseical theory hypothesizes the demand for labor as positively related to output, negatively to wages, and positively to prices of substitute inputs. In equation form, employment functions may be expressed as follows:
(2) $L_{1}=f\left(Q_{1} ;\right.$ WAGE, INT, $\left.e_{1}\right)$
where:

```
Li = quantity of labor employed In the ith RNE
        1
        sector
WAGE = datly wage save
        INT = interest. rate
        e = error term
        1
```

Output is captured in the model by way of sectoral value added while prices of eubetitute inputs are represented either by the nominal rates of 91-day treasury bills (TBILL) or ite real value (TBILL minue the inflation rate), or by the amount of capital inveetment made in the ith RNE sector. Since capital le relatively scarce, increases in the price of capital or in the interest rate would decrease desired capital and hence increase the demand for labor.

In the demand functions, the sectoral price level appeare as an explanatory variable, while in the price equations. the sectoral price level is the dependent variable. In the latter, sectoral prices are regressed with the wholesale price index which is an exogenous variable in the RNE submodel but an endogenous variable in the macroeconometric model. In the latter, the wholesale price is a function of supply and demand factors. The wholesale price index is hypothesized to be determined by a pricing ruie characterized by stable mark-upe over variable cost in the short run. Variable coste typically consist of labor and imported intermediariee, hence, WPI is a function of wages and the price of importe of goods and services (represented by the implicit price deflator of goods and services). The mark-up rate is influenced positively by the rate of capacity utilization of firms. An increase in capacity utilization would cause inventories' to dwindle, inducing firms to increase their mark-up and profite. Such increases in the demand and capacity utilization are proxied by the ratio of total liquidity to potential groes national
product which ie expected to affect prices positively. In the estimated equations inthe macroeconometric model, wages have a relatively greater coefficient than the two other determinants reflecting the propensity of firms to pass on to coneumere of their output any increaces in wages.

The linkage of the sectoral pricee of RNEs is therefore expreseed by the price functions relating them with the wholesale price index. In addition, the lagged price is appended to indicate the effect of prices. In previous periode. Thus, the RNE price functions may be etated as:
(3) $\mathrm{P}_{1}=\mathrm{f}\left(\right.$ WPI, $\left.\mathrm{P}_{1-1}, \mathrm{~V}_{1}\right)$.
where: $\quad P=$ implicit price index for the industry 1 sector WPI = wholesale price indea

$$
V=\text { error term }
$$

1
Two identities were specified, one each for output and employment buch that (1) the eummation of real GVAs of the 12 RNE eectore equals the total GVA for all RNEs; and (2) the summation of all employment in the 12 RNE eectors equals the total employment for all RNEs. That is,

where:
QRNES = aggregate real GVA in all RNEs (million pesos)
LRNES. = aggregate employment in all RNEe (thoueande)
While no separate analysie wae made for nonfarm enterprises located in Metro Manila, when the submodel wae linked to the macroeconometric model, two conditione were imposed. Firstly, output of nonfarm enterprises in Metro Manila and the rural areas muet be equal to total manufacturing output. These same condition should hold for employment. That is,

```
QMFG = QRNES + QMM
LMFG = LRNES + LMM
```

where $\operatorname{QMM}$ and LMM are reepectively real GVA and employment in nonfarn enterpriees in Metro Manila and QMFG and LMFG are total.GVA and employment respectively for all manufacturing induetries.

The behavioral equatione were estimated ueing ordinary least squares, Where necessary, autocorrelation was corrected by adding the lagged dependent variable or by using the Cochrane Orcutt procedure.

### 6.2 Demand Equations

Table 6.1 presenus the estimated demand equations for each of the 12 RNEs . As hypothesized, price coefficients are negative while those of consumption expenditures are positive. The price coefficiente were statistically significant in the following RNEe: textile, wood, paper, chemicals, petroleum, machineries, electricity and othere.

The demand elaeticity of food with respect to its own price is quite low, only -0.016, that is a ten percent increase in the price index for food would reeult in only 0.16 of one per cent increase in value added from rural food induetries (Table 6.2). The coefficient from which thie elasticity is derived is statistically significant. In a number of specifications of the food demand equation, the population coefficient was highly significant indicating that population ia a more important factor to reckon with in changes in demand for food rather than pricee. . However, it should be noted that the prices are aggregate price index for food rather than rural price. But rural food nonfarm enterprises face both rural and urban markete as well as international markete. Although positive, food exporte, however, did not have a significant coefficient in another specification of the demand function.

Consumption expenditures represented by the summation of private and government expendituree had a eignificant coefficient with a positive sign.

Like food, demand for beverages was not significantly influenced, by pricee although the price coefficient was negative. Beverages have an inelaetic demand indicating that people would change the consumption of soft drinks, beer, ginebra and others only to a very little extent when prices increase. The coefficient of consumption

Table 6.1 Estimated Demand Equations for Rural Nonfarm Enterprises

```
INDUSTRY GROUP
    EQUATION
```

FOOD:

```
QFOOD = -2733.6918 -0.93347* (PFOOD/CPI) * 100
    (-0.4140) (-0.0159)
    +0.01943 * (CP+CG) +683.51469 * DV8489
    (1.4821) (0.7948)
```

    -143.40917 * TIME
    (-0.6450)
    \(R^{2}=0.786 \quad \mathrm{SER}=440.939^{\circ} \mathrm{DW}=1.806 \quad \mathrm{~F}=9.178\)
    1975-89
    BEVERAGES:
$\begin{aligned} \text { QBEV }= & \begin{array}{c}-403.21505 \\ (-1.1139)\end{array} \quad-1.15848 *(-0.7231) \\ & +0.00207 *(\mathrm{PBEV} / \mathrm{CPI}) * 100 \\ & (4.5230) \\ & \mathrm{R}=0.852 \quad \mathrm{CE}) \\ & \end{aligned}$ 1976-89

TOBACCO:

```
QTOB = -89.73009 -0.12823* (PTOB/CPI)
        (-1.1964) (-0.4495)
        +0.00041 * CP -5.14859 * TIME
        (1.6472) (-1.2626)
        +0.10007 * XTOB
        (0.5776)
        2
        R=0.669 SER = 7.9808 DW =2.763 . F = 4.546
        1976-89
```

Table 6.1 Estimeted Demand Equations (continued)

## 

 INDUSTRY GROUP EQUATIONTEXTILE:

```
QTEX = -2174.5095 - 0.80588 * PTEX +0.00027 * CP
    (-3.0729) (-3.2493) (0.1585).
+64.79319 * POP
(2.2402)
R}=0.872\quadSER=56.301 DW = 2.172 . F=25.056
                                    1975-89
```

WOOD:

| QWOOD $=$ | $\begin{aligned} & -801.67882 \\ & (-4.3812) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.99518 * \text { PWOOD } \\ & (=7.7616) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +0.00444 ; \\ & +(7.5800) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & +104.58312 \\ & (3.2272) \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | DV8486 |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{R}=0.851$ | $\mathrm{SER}=40.592$ | $D W=2.560$ | $F=20.869$ |

PAPER:

```
QPAP \(=-1.90664 \quad-2.1624 *(\mathrm{PPAP} / \mathrm{CPI}) * 100\)
    (-0.0106) (-1.1633)
    \(+0.00101 *(C P+C G)+0.14008 *(-1.90664-2.16236 *\)
    (4.4939) (0.4821)
    (PPAP /CPI ) * 100
        -1 -1
        \(\left.00101 *\left(\mathrm{CP}_{-1}+\mathrm{CG}_{-1}\right)-\mathrm{QPAP}_{-1}\right)\)
        \(R=0.611 \quad S E R=44.549 \quad D W=1.337 \quad F=5.237\)
                        1976-89
```

Table 6.1 Estimated Demand Equations (continued)

## 

 INDUSTRY GROUP EQUATIONCHEMICALS:


PETROLEUM:

```
QPET = -110.92069 -0.50561 * (PPET/CPI) * 100
        (-0.2668) (-1.3934)
        +0.00342* (CP+CG) +0.00032 * XPET
        (3.0428): (0.9949)
        -42.14743 * TIME +0.20169 * QPET
        (-3.1088) : (0.8012).
        R2}=0.753 SER=50.751 DN=2.163 F = 4.879
        1976-89
```

BASIC METALS:
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Table 6.1 Estimated Demand Equations (continued)
 INDUSTRY GROUP EQUATION

MACHINERIES:

```
QMACH \(=-633.63333 \quad-0.82530 * \mathrm{FMACH}\)
    (-3.1285) (-3.1211)
    \(+0.00280 *(\mathrm{CP}+\mathrm{CG}) \quad+0.00011 * \mathrm{XMACH}\)
    (4.0798) (0.1480)
    -0.22549 * GMACH
                                \(-1\)
    (1.2209)
    \(R^{2}=0.817 \quad S E R=50.209 \quad D N=3.186 \quad F=10.042\)
                                    1976-89
```

ELECTRICAL:

```
QELEC = -4362.6594 -2.45956 * PELEC
        (-2.3448) (-1.2456)
        +110.10635* POP -0.21334 * XELEC
        (2.2654) (-2.4236)
            2 =0.921. SER = 88.989 DN = 1.598. F}=38.66
                1976-89
```

OTHERS:

```
QOTH = -11268.157 -5.05068*(POTH/CPI)* 100
    (-3.4984) (-1.7384)
    +0.00145 * (CP+CG) +286.28191 * POR
    (2.0898) (3.7066)
    -361.30877 * TIME
    (-3.5913)
    2
    R=0.813 . SER= 38.809 1975-89 \N =2.437. . F = 10.846
```

    Note: figures in parentheses are \(t\) values
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## Table 6.2 Estimatee of Price Elașticities of Demand by RNE Sector

| INDUSTRY GROUP | PRICE ELASTICITY |
| :---: | :---: |
| Food | -0.0155 |
| Beverage | -0.2974 |
| Tobacco | -0.3429 |
| Wood | -0.6862 |
| Paper | -0.7698 |
| Chemicals | -0.1849 |
| Petroleum | -0.0753 |
| Machineries | -0.9376 |
| Electrical | -1.8754 |
| Others | -1.0944 |
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expenditures was.highly aignificant and poeitive and at the mean values indicated a high income elasticity of 2.22 . The two variables - price index and consumption expenditures explained 85 percent of the variation in the demand for beverages.

Among the variablee ueed•in eotimating the demand functions for tobacco, only private consumption expenditures and time showed statietically significant coefficients. The price coefficient in the demand equation presented in Table 6.1 is not eignificant albeit negative. In another formulation of the demand equation, however, the own price index had a significant coefficient. The demand for tobacco manufactures of RNEs is inelaetic with price elasticity of 0.34 which implies that a in price of tobacco manufacture such ae cigarettee, ciger, and the like would result in only a slight change in the quantity demanded.

Income as proxied by private consumption expendituree had a positive and significant effect on the demand for tobacco manufactures.

The time variable had a negative coefficient although eignificant only at a low level. As indicated in Chapter 3 there are feare expressed in the industry regarding the health hazards posed by smoking. Developed countriee such as the United States, Canada, Japan and others have shown considerable concern in these health hazards in their policiea. Thus, tobacco exports did not seem. to have significantly affected demand for tobacco manufactures.

The demand for textile, garmente, footwear and related producte was significantly influenced by prices and population. Together with private consumption expenditures, they explained 87 percent of the variation in the demand for textile products. The demand foe textile products is Inelastic with a price elasticity of -0.686 .

The coefficients of price and coneumption expenditures for the demand for wood producte were significant and had the hypothesized signs and together with a dummy variable explained 85 percent of the variations in demand for wood: The demand had almost a unitary elasticity at the meane, 0.98 .

The demand for paper, paper producte, printing and publiehing was inelastic with an elasticity with respect to its own price of $-0: 770$. The coefficient of consumption equal only to 0.61 .

The demand for chemical products of RNEs was a difficult equation to eetimete. Price and consumption expenditures when ueed together in another specification of the model (that $1 \varepsilon$, other than the one shown in Table 6.1) produced the correct signe and gignificant coefficients but 2
$R$ was very low at 0.23 . Adding exports yielded a slightiy 2.
higher but still low $R$ of only 0.385 . One possible explanation ie the variablity in the useb of chemical products, e.g. fertilizer and pesticidee/insecticides for agricultural production and druge for human health and disease prevention. The demand elasticity with respect to price was therefore very low, -0.185 at the mean values.

As expected, petroleum producte have a highly inelastic demand with a price elasticity at the mean valuee of -0.075. Total consumption expenditures (that is, private plue government) positively and.eignificantly influenced demand for petroleum products. When the implicit price index was not deflated by the consumer price index (CPI) the price coefficient had a highẹr t value ( -2.833 ), but together with coneumption expenditures and exporte of petroleum producte (which had a significant and positive coefficient) yielded a 2
$R$ of only 0.557.
Like chemicals, the demand for producte of basic metal industries was quite difficult to eetimate. Price and population together explained 93 percent of the variation in demand however the frice coefficient was positive. Population when used ae the lone independent variable in the 2
demand equation yielded a $R$ of 0.879 which indicates the large extent to which population explained the variation in demand for basic metals. The coefficient of population is positive and highly significant.

The demand for machineries (except electrical) and transport equipment was hypothesized to depend on price, aggregate consumption expenditures on the domestic side, and exports on the international side. Together, with the lagged depandent variable; they explain 82 percent of the variation In the value added. The price coefficient was negative and highly eignificant and showed that at the mean values, demand for machineries and transport equipment produced by RNEs almost had unitary elasticity, -0.94. Thus a ten percent increase in the implicit price index for these products would result in a 9.4 percent decline in output or value added. Consumption expenditures, likewise, had a highly significant coefficient but export was not a significant factor.

The demand for electrical apparatue, appliances, and supplies was hypotheeized to be influenced by prices, population, coneumption expenditures and exports.

Consumption expenditure yielded a noneignificant coefficient and was deleted in the demend equation. The three remaining variablea explained.a large percentage, 92 percent, of the variation in demand although the price coefficient was significant only at a low level. Notwithstanding this low level of significance, it is worthwhile to note that electrical products from RNEs have an elastic demand. This is in contrast to all the other industries discuesed above which had an inelaetic demand curve. The own price elasticity coefficient of demand for electrical producte at the mean values is estimated to be equal to -1.875 . Thue, a one percent increase in the implicit price index would be expected to result in a greater than one percent increase in output or value added. Electricai products beine a mador export of the Philippines, it was eurprising to find that the coefficient of the exports variable was negative.

For all other manufactured producte of RNEs, aggregate demand was regressed with price which yielded a negative coefficient; total congumption expenditures with a positive coefficient; population which was positively related to demand; and time which yielded a negative coefficient. All coefficients were statistically eignificant and except for time had the expected eigns. All the variables explained 81 percent of the varlation in demand for other manufactures.

To summarize, pricee yielded the hypotheelzed negative coefficient which were statistically significant. for most induetries. Likewiee, coefficients of aggregate consumption expenditures were generally positive and eignificant. The results for exports were mixed in that some equatione have positive coefficients as hypothesized but a few were nonsignificant. Population. was a significant factor in the demand equations for textile, basic metale, electrical producte, and other manufactures.

It would have been interesting to analyze the effect of the power shortage on output and employment of RNEs. However, there is no: time series data for this variable and therefore it cannot be incorporated in the model.

In a report presented by the secretary of Economic Planning Cielito P. Habito to the President, losees caused by the persistent brownoute have been eetimeted at 20 billion to E25 billion by the NEDA. Thie amount repreeente 1.3 to 1.6 percent of GNP. The manufacturing eectors most severely affected by the power shortage include the following: nonmetallic mineral products, rubber products, publiehing and printing, footwear and wearing apparel, chemical and chemical producte and miscellaneous manufacturés.

On employment, NEDA reported that 66.444 firms or 58.8 percent of the total firms in Metro Manila were affeoted. In the regions, 112,634 firms in Regione $2,4,5,10$ and the Cordillera Autonomoue Region were eeverely affected by the power.brownout (Manila Bulletin, July 1, 1993). The impact of the brownout was felt more in the NCR where industries are more power dependent and among the small and medium scale industries which had the least capability to cope with the power ehortfall.

NEDA also estimates that half of the employed workers in the NOR were affected by the power crisis in comparison to only six percent in the other regions. Neverthelese, lay-offe were minimized by either rotating or reducing the worktine of the employees.

### 6.3 Employment Equations

The estimated equations for employment in each of the twelve sectore of rural nonfarm enterprises are presented in Table 6.3. The coefficients of output (or value added) were positive and generally eignificant in food, wood, paper, chemical, petroleum, machinery, electrical and other manufacturing industries. The daily wage rate of unskilled labor was expressed either as an index with 1985 ab the base or deflated by the implicit price index for Groes National Product (PGNP). The coefficients for thie variable were negative thus conforming with theoretical expectation. For other inpute, capital investment was ueed in the employment equations for food, beverages, textile, wood, machineries and electrical industriee. Rates for 91-day Treasury Bille which were expreseed either in nominal or real terms were used as proxy for intereet on capital in the employment equations for tobacco, paper, chemicale, fetroleum and basic metals RNEs. Previous year's employment appeared ae a significant variable for some industries.

The amount of labor employed in the food sector of RNEE significantly depends on the eectoral output as shown by the poeitive coefficient of QFOOD in the employment equation. A one percent increase in output would result in almost the same ( 0.95 percent) percentage change in employment in food manufacturing in RNEs. The wage coefficient, although negative, was not eignificant and deflating the wage rate by the implicit price index of GNP did not improve the equation. Additional investment within the induetry eeeme to complement labor thus increasing the demand for labor and the three variables together explained 68 percent: of the variation in employment in the food industries.

Table 6.3 Estimated Employment Equations for Rural Nonfarn Enterprises

| INDUSTRY GROUP EMPLOMMENT EQUATION |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FOOD: |  |  |  |  |
| LFOOD $=$ | $\left.\begin{array}{lll} -8.64060 \\ (-0.1934)(2.7753) \end{array}\right) \quad \begin{aligned} & -0.00351 \\ & (-0.0124) \end{aligned} * \text { WAGE }$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & +0.01010 * \mathrm{KFOOD} \\ & (1.2413) . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{R}=0.678$ | $\begin{aligned} S E R= & 17.357 \\ & 1975-89 \end{aligned}$ | $D N=1.635$ | $\mathrm{F}=7.728$ |
| BEVERAGES: |  |  |  |  |
| LBEV = | 29.23827. $+0.01526 *(($ QBEV $/($ QBEV $)-1) * 100$(8.0781) $(0.73596)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\left.\begin{array}{l} -8.83205 \\ (-3.3436) \\ 2 \end{array}\right) \text { (WAGE/PGNP) * }+0.00136 * \mathrm{KBEV}$ |  |  | 1976-89 |
|  | $\mathrm{R}=0.660$ | - $\quad \mathrm{SER}=1.682$. | DW $=1.255$ | $\mathrm{F}=6.466$. |
| TOBACCO: |  |  |  |  |
| LTOB $=$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1.60803 \\ & (-0.7056) \underset{(0.0804)}{+0.00201} \end{aligned} * \text { QTOB } \underset{(1.1612)}{+1.91126} * \text { (WAGE/PGNP) }$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & +0.1156 * \text { TBILL } \\ & \text { (2.2046) } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{R}=0.310$ | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{SER}= & 0.943 \\ & 1975-89 \end{aligned}$ | . $D W=1.510$ | $F=1.651$ |
| TEXTILE: |  |  |  |  |
| LTEX $=$ | 129.52479 +0.04226 <br> $(1.3609)$ $(0.3290)$GTEX$-0.48057 *$ WAGE <br> $(-1.0264)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & +0.00356 * \mathrm{KTEX} \\ & (0.1152) \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{R}=0.099$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SER}= 52.835 \\ & 1975-89 \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{DW}=2.060$ | $F=0.403$ |

Table 6.3 Estimated Employment Equations (continued).

## PAPER:

```
LPAP \(=10.87672\) : +0.02037 * QPAP
    (2.9071) (3.3082)
    -2.76454 * (WAGE/PGNP) + +0.00101 * TBILL
    \((-1.3745) \quad(0.0154)\)
    -2.57221 * DV8489
    (-2.4548)
    2
    \(R=0.647 \quad \mathrm{SER}=1.062 \quad \mathrm{DW}=2.042 \quad \mathrm{~F}=4.584\)
```

        1975-89
    WOOD:
    LWOOD \(=33.85382+0.59925 *((Q W O O D / Q W O O D)-1) *\) Luv
    (0.8935) (2.1363)
    -2.01705 * (WAGE/PGNP) +0.00533 * KWOOD
    ( -0.0990 ) (0.5026)
    +6.85652 * DV8489 +0.56174* LWOOD)
    (0.8904) (2.3555)
    \(R^{2}=0.620 \quad\) SER \(=8.301 \quad D W=2.764 \quad F=2.615\)
                                    1976-89
    PETROLEUM:

```
LPET: \(=2.28302+0.00152 *\) QPET \(-1.81623 *\) (WAGE/PGNP)
    (1.2690) (1.0599) (4.0035)
    +0.03480 * (TBILL-INEL)
    (2.4829)
    2
    \(R=0.665 \quad \mathrm{SER}=0.360 \quad \mathrm{DW}=2.406 \quad \mathrm{~F}=7.294\)
```

                                1975-89
    Table 6.3 Estimated Employment Equations (continued)


```
    INDUSTRY GROUP
        EMPLOYMENT EQUATION
    CHEMICALS:
    LCHEM = 14.88670 +0.01223 * QCHEM
        (2.8472) (2.8726)
        -4.07444 * (TBILL-INFL)
        (0.4077)
        R2}=0.578\quadSER=2.400 DW = 1.382. F = 5.023
        1975-89
    BASIC METALS
LBSM = 15.53703 +0.00097* QBSM -7.96737* (WAGE/PGNP)
        (3.5140) (0.6436)
                                (-3.0179)
    +0.07338 * (TBILL - INFL)
        (1.4000)
        2
        R=0.762 SER = 1.389. DW = 1.905 F = 11.721
                        1975-89
MACHINERIES
```

```
LMACH = 19.61147 +0.04263 * QMACH +0.01865 * KMACH
```

LMACH = 19.61147 +0.04263 * QMACH +0.01865 * KMACH
* (2.3054) (2.5303) (1.5267)
* (2.3054) (2.5303) (1.5267)
+8.18507 * DV8489 -0.17411 * LMACH
+8.18507 * DV8489 -0.17411 * LMACH
(2.4852) (-0.6676)
(2.4852) (-0.6676)
R}\mp@subsup{}{}{2}=0.567\quadSER=4.026 DW = 2.363 F:=2.945
R}\mp@subsup{}{}{2}=0.567\quadSER=4.026 DW = 2.363 F:=2.945
1976-89

```
        1976-89
```


## Table 6.3 Estimated Employment Equations (continued)

INDUSTRY GROUP EMPLOYMENT EQUATION

## ELECTRICAL

LELEC $=1.73017+0.00781 *(($ QELEC/QELEC $)-1) * 100$
(0.4407) (1.5682)
-0.98540 * (WAGE/PGNP) $\quad+0.00529 *$ KEL ( -0.3439 ) (1.6703)
+C 8*301 * LFTEC

```
(4.0752)
2
R =0.918. SER = 1.388 . DN:=2.993: : F=22.394
```

                                    1977-89
    OTHERS
LOTH $=-10.93909+0.26763 *((40 \mathrm{TH} / 60 \mathrm{TH})-1) * 100$
(-0.7681) (2.3010)
+29.32760 * (WAGE/PGNP) +6.23690 * DV8489 (2.8931) (1.8824)

| +0.14787* LOTH ${ }_{-1}$ |  |  | 1977-89 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| (0.6308) |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{R}=0.624$ | SER $=4.075$ | $\mathrm{DW}=2.699$ | $F=3.321$ |

Note: Figures in parentheses are t-values

The $R$ for the beverage employment equation is almost the same as that for food, however; here QBEV entered as. a percentage change and daily wage rate in real terms and only the real wage rate coefficient was significant. Other formulatione of the employment equation showed a poitive 2 and significant coefficient of QBEV but $R$ was lower.

The tobacco and textile employment equations were difficult to estimate with the output variable yielding a poeitive but nonsignificant coefficient. Moreover, for tobacco the real wage cofficient was positive and the $R$ was quite low. However, the TBILL rate coefficient has the correct sign and was significant. The textile equation used capitai investment as a variable thich procuced a positive but also not significant coefficient:

Employment in the wood industries was explained by a number of variables inoluding a dummy varlable and the lagged dependent variable all of which explained 62 percent of the variation in the employment. The number of workers in the industry in the previous year is expected to affect employment positively because of difficuities in terminating appointments of workers and possibly the desire to continue hiring previouely trained workers. QWOOD entered as a percentage change which yielded a positive and significant coefficient.

The employment of the paper and paper producte, printing and publiehing indutry in the regions ie a function of output, real wage rate, intereet rate as proxied by the' Treasury Bill rate, and a dummy variable all of which explained 65 percent of the variations in LPAP. Output significantly influenced employment which had an elasticity of 0.461 . This implies that a 10 percent increase in output would be expected to raise employment by 4.6 percent. The real wage rate had a negative effect on employment with a regression coefficient of -2.76 , that 1s; an increase, in real wage by 10 percentage points would reduce employment in the paper industry by approximately 28 thoueand people.

The coefficient of the TBILL rate was positive Indicating that an increase in interest rate would make capital more expensive and therefore firms would tend to eubetitute labor for capital. The coefficient of the dummy variable for 1984 to 1989 proved to be negative and statietically eignificant. It appeared that the orieie period which started in 1983 took effect immediately during the succeeding year. with the effect being carried through until 1989.

Two major variables, output and real intereet rate, determined the level of employment in the chemical industries in the rural areas. These two factors explained 58 percent of the variation in employment in the sector. The coefficiente have the correct signs and were statistically significant. The elasticity coefficient of labor demand with respect to output or value added was equal to 0.41 while a one percentage point increase in real interest rate would tend to reduce employment in the rural chemical induetries by about four thousand people.

The significant determinants of employment in rural based petroleum product industries were output, real wage rate, and real intereet rate. The employemnt elasticity with respect to output was almost equal to unity (0.94)
 of the induetry would change number of workers by almost the same percentage. However, an increase in real wage rate would tend to reduce employment while a riee in intereet rate would change employment in the same direction.

The wage rate and the intereet rate both expreesed in real terme eignificantly influenced employment in the baeic metal induetries in the rural areae. As hypothesized, they had opposite effecte, negative for wage rate and positive for intereet rate. Together with output which had a positive but non-significant coefficient, they explained 76 percent of the variation in the number of people employed by the basic metal industries. A low elastioity of employment with respect to output was estimated, 0.135 .. In contraet, employemnt in machineriee (except electrical) and traneport equipment had a relatively higher (although still inelastic) elasticity of 0.379 . In addition to output capital investment in the. Industry and a dummy variable for 1984 to 1989 aleo eignificantly effected the demand for labor.

The demand for labor by electricel rural induetriee is determined 'by the percentage' change in output, capital investment, and lagged employment. Being capital intensive, additional investments would increase the demand for labor, so with an improvement in the growth rate of output. The manufacture of electrical appliances, apparatus and supplies would require trained labor, and once trained, managere may be hesitant to terininate workers, thus the positive of relationship previous employment within the industry. A 2
high $R$ of 0.92 was obtained for the employment equation.
The determinante of employment in other manufacturing industries include the percentage change in the output which have a positive coefficient; the dummy variable for 1984 to

1989, and employment in the previoue year. contrary to expectations, the real wage rate yielded a positive coefficient although in other formulations of the employment function, the coefficent of the real wage rate was negative 2
but nonsignificant. $R$ was estimated at 0.62 . In another formulation of the model, the real interest rate was positive but not significant and together with output and real wage yielded a very low $R$.

### 6.4 Price Functions

The estiated prame fumstons relating cectoral price indexes with the wholesale price index (WPI) are presented in Table. 6.4. In all equations the WPI had highly significant coefficients. Likewise, where the lagged dependent variable was added as an explanatory variable, the coefficients were positive and highly eignificant. Except
for the petroleum price equation, all functiona had a $R$ greater than 0.99. Nevertheless, WPI and the lagged dependent variable explained 88 percent of the variation in petroleum pricee.

The percentage changee in the bectoral prices resulting from a one percent change in WPI or the elaeticity coefficients are shown in Table 6.5. They are close to unity ( 0.90 or higher) for food, paper, and chemical industries; around 0.5 for tobacco, textile, wood and basic metals. The elasticity of petroleum price is quite low, 0.15 , understandably so because petroleum prices are fixed by government.

Table 6.4. Estimated Price Equations

INDUSTRY GROUP EQUATION

FOOD

```
PFOOD = 21.06161 +0.61887 * WPI
    (4.7190) (103.0000)
    R}=0.999 SER=9.258 DW = 1.878 F=10608.98
    1975-1989
```

BEVERAGE

```
PBEV = 81.24329 +0.31984* WPI +0.46804 * PBEV
    (4.8817) (5.0469) (3.8924)
    R
        1976-89
```

TOBACCO
PTOB $=4.50902+0.38742 *$ WPI $\quad+0.45931 *$ PIOB
(0.4003)(7.5780) (5.3712)
$R=0.995 \quad \mathrm{SER}=21.652 \quad \mathrm{DW}=1.655 \quad \mathrm{~F}=996.577$ 1976-89
TEXTILE
PTEX =
$54.31053+0.57152 *$ WPI

| $(5.2097)(10.4887)$ |
| :--- |
| $R^{2}$ |$=0.998 \quad$ SER $=18.754$

$1976-89$.
+0.36414 * PTEX
(5.3395)
$\mathrm{DW}=1.362 \quad \mathrm{~F}=2273.183$ 1976-89

WOOD

$$
\begin{array}{rll}
\text { FWOOD }= & 84.88729+0.46230 * \text { WPI } & +0.28226 * \text { PWCOD } \\
& \begin{array}{llll}
(4.9900) & (5.7932) & (2.0936) & -1
\end{array} \\
R^{2}=0.992 & \text { SER }=24.309 & \text { DW }=1.936
\end{array} \quad F=723.368
$$

Table 6.4. Estimated Price Equations (continued)
$\square$
INDUSTRY GROUP EQUATION

PAPER
PPAP $=44.42681+0.63731 *$ WPI
(3.9879) (42.4933)
$\begin{aligned} R^{2}=0.993 \quad & \quad \mathrm{SER}=23.109 \quad \mathrm{DW}=1.376 \quad \mathrm{~F}=1805.68 \\ 1975-89 & \end{aligned}$

## CHEMICALS

PCHEM $=: 40.43341 \cdot+0.60310 *$ WPI
(3.5143) (38.9366)
. 2
$R=0.991 \quad$ SER $=23.867 \quad D W=1.799 \quad F=1516.056$
1975-89
PETROLEUM
PPET $=158.00718+0.23231 * W P I+0.72896 *$ PPET $^{\circ}$
(1.5913) (0.7247)
(2.76970
$R^{2}=0.882 \quad S E R=179.657 \quad D W=1.286 \quad F=41.265$ 1976-89

BASIC METALS
PBSM $=\quad 14.18877+0.36213 * W P I \quad+0.38417 \&$ PBSM

$$
(1.7235)(9.4995) \quad(4.7553)
$$

$R^{2}=0.996$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { SER } & =14.895 \cdot D N=1.317 \quad F=1425.457 \\
& 1976-89
\end{aligned}
$$

ELECTRICAL
PELEC $=68.89168 \quad+0.31798 * W P I$
(11.5153) (39.4799)
$R^{2}=0.992 \quad S E R=12.410 \quad$ DN $=1.475 \quad \quad \dot{F}=1558.663$

## Table 6.4. Estimated : Price Equations (continued)

$\square$
INDUSTRY GROUP EQUATION

MACHINERY
PMACH $=3.67253+0.411901 *$ WPI $+0.22378 *$ PMACH
(0.4639) (11.3121) (2.8993) -1

```
R
``` 1976-89

OTHERS
\(\mathrm{POTH}=11.69538+0.62770 * \mathrm{WPI}+0.30233 *\) POTH (0.8479) (8.8800) (3.3781)
\(R^{2}=0.995 \quad S E R=26.530 \quad D W=1.740 \quad \mathrm{~F}=1145.678\) 1976-89

Note: Figures in parentheses are't-values.

Table 6.5. Percentage Change in Sectoral Price with Respect to a One Percent Change in Wholesale Price
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline INDUSTRY GROUP & PERCENTAGE CHANGE \\
\hline FOOD & 0.95 \\
\hline BEVERAGE & 0.40 \\
\hline TOBACCO & 0.56 \\
\hline TEXTILE & 0.56 \\
\hline WOOD & 0.56 \\
\hline PAPER & 0.90 \\
\hline CHEMICALS & 0.90 \\
\hline PETROLEUM & 0.15 \\
\hline BASIC METALS & 0.60 \\
\hline MACHINERIES & 0.76 \\
\hline ELECTRICAL & 0.74 \\
\hline OTHERS & 0.68 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{CHAPTER 7}

\section*{EFFECT OF MACROECONOMIC POLICIES ON OUTPUT, EMPLOYMENT AND PRICES}

\author{
7.1. Validation of the Model
}

A macroeconomic model is constructed with three basic objectives, namely (1) for etruatural analysie, (2) for forecasting, and (3) for evaluation of policy effects. This section attempts to determine the tracking ability of the model through e fully dynamic gimulation for the period 1981 to 1989.

The submodel discused in Chapter 6 analyzed the behavior and structiure of output, employment and prices of rural nonfarm enterprises. To determine the effects of macroeconomic policies the RNE equations are linked with the PIDS-NEDA macroeconometric model. This model consiste of four major blocks such as (1) the real sector which ie composed of production, expenditure, and employment, wages and prices; (2) the fiscal sector; (3) the financial sector, and (4) the external sector.

The production eector and the expenditure eector are linked primarily through the demand functions whereby aggregate expenditures appear as determinante of the quantity demended. In the Induetrial sector, a price equation functions as a supply equation with output determined by the level of demand. In turn, output determines the level of prices and employment.

The linkages in the other eectors may be summarized as follows: "The financial eector affects. output via the interest rate, the amount of net foreign aesets and the liquidity variable which enters the different price equations. It aleo affecte the external eectore (imports) through the level of foreign aseets. The fiscal sector influences the monetary base and interest rate through the method of financing the budget deficit. It alpo affecte the real sector through expenditures on capital and operating expenses which determine the level of output.. The external sector affecte the other eactor of the economy through the linkage of the various current account componente with output and expendituree, as well as its contribution to net foreign assets" (Reyes and Yap, 1993).

The submodel focueed on output and enployment. Price equations were eetimated by relating eectoral prices with the wholesale price index which in the PIDS NEDA MEM is a function of nominal wages, implicit price deflator for imports and services, and the ratio of total liquidity to potential GNP which in turn is a function of capital stock and labor force. Note that the consumer price index and the implicit price deflator for GNP were albo used to deflate sectoral prices and wagee, respectively.

The eimulatione were undertaiken for the period 1981 to 1989.

A criterion ueed to evaluate a model ie the fit of the individual variables in a simulation context (Pindyck and Rubinfeld, 1981). One would expect the results of a historical simulation, i.e. a eimulation through the estimation period, to match closely the behavior of the real world. To test the performance of the model, a hietorical simulation is made. How closely each endogenoue variable tracks its corresponding hietorical data series ie examined. To measure this tracking ability of the model, the root mean square (RMS) simulation error can be ueed as indicator. The RMS simulation error for a variable \(X\) ie defined as

where:
```

XSIM = simulated value of the variable X.
t
XACT = actual value of the variable X
T = number of years in the eimulation

```

The RMS exror ie a measure of the deviation of the simulated variable from ite actual time path and the magnitude of the error can be evaluated only by comparing it with the average aize of the variable in question.

Another measure of simulation fit is the RMS. percent error (RMSPE) which is defined as follows:
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The RMSPE is a measure of the deviation of the simulated variable from ite actual time path expreseed in percentage terms.

The root mean equare percent error statistics for grose value added, employment and price based on the model estimates discussed in Chapter 6 are presented in Table 7.1. Except for QTOB, the RMSPE statistios is lese than 25 percent. It is noteworthy that the gross value added for food, textile, petroluem and othere have a RMSPE of lese than 10 percent and the summation of grose value added of all rural nonfarm enterprises has a RMSPE of only 5.87.

For employment, only tobacco and petroleum induetries have a relatively high RMSPE etatietice but those for all other induatries are less than 20 percent: \(\%\) The aggregate employment (LRNES) equation (identity) performed quite. well with a RMSPE of less than 10 percent.

The performance of the price equations appeare to be much better than the output and employment equations. Except for petroleum, all RMSPE statistice are lees than 10 percent. Moreover, five out of the 12 sectore have RMSPE statistics less than 5 percent. These indicate a good tracking ability of the model with respect to PFOOD, PBEV, PWOOD and PELEC. Two other price equations -PPAP and POTHhave a RMSPE of just slightly greater then 5 peroent. For petroleum, it should be pointed out that prices are determined more by government policy rather than the free market forces. The average price index for all RNEs has a RMSPE of 5.96 percent.

\subsection*{7.2 Effect of Selected Policies on Output, Employment and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises}

Three major policies were considered in the eimulation of the effects on output, employment and pricee, namely, wage rate, exchange rate, and export policies as reflected In the change in volume of merchandise exporte.. These are three major policies followed by the Philippine government. Moreover, wage rate, exchange rate, and volume of exporte were three variables that aignificantly affected RNEs ae shown by the eignificance of their coefficients. These are also policies which can easily be quantified. Iikewise, it could be expected that they would have effects on the general industry groupas claseified, i.e. food, chemical, etc. A specific policy, such as the coconut levy would have more direct and significant effects on the coconut induetry compared with the whole food industry or with other industry groups. In comparison, change in wages or exchange rate would affect a number (if not all) of the industry, groups.

When the eimulatione were made, a conetraint wae imposed such that the change in the variables in the RNE model would not have an effect on the macro model. Where applicable, the same data set used in the macro model was ueed in the RNE model, e.g. wage, exchange rate, coneumption expenditures, etc.

Specific policies were analyzed in this section. Theee are; (1) a ten percent increase in wage rate; (2) a ten percent increase in the exchange rate; and (3) an increase in merchandiee exporte equivalent to one percent of GDP in the baseline. Simulation exercisee were performed for the period 1981 to 1989. The policy change was sugtained for the entire simulation period.

\subsection*{7.2.1. Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Wage Rate}

As noted in the employment equationd in Chapter 6 , wages were negatively related to employment. An increase in wage rate therefore would reduce the employment and coneequently bring down the ievel of output. The effect on employment of a ten percent increase in wage rate is a deciine of slightly. lees than one perent in employment in the food RNEs, in the initial year which increases to 1.8 percent in the eecond year (Table 7.2).. The percentage decine later goes up although at a decreabing rate. the change in food output follows the same trend but the percentage change is higher than that for employment. The reeulting percentage change in food prices ie higher at 3.39 percent in the initial year increasing eteadily until 1989 when it reaches a rise of 7.90 percent.

The level of employment in the beverage aector is lower than that for food and because of this lower base, the percentage decilne in employment ie higher, 10 percent in the first year and increasing to 15 in the second year but getting a little bit lower until 1984 after which the percentage drop increages to 15 percent again in 1987. The effect on output is aleo downward but to a much leeser extent ranging from one to three percent per year. Raising wage rate by ten percent increased prices of beverage producte by up to 6.6 per:cent.

The effect on employment in tobacco industries, ie surprieingly poeitive but output declined and prices went up.

The textile induetry which employe more than a hundred thousand workers in the rural areas was affected by a wage rate increase by a four percent drop in employment in 1981 and up to 32 percent in 1989, The value added, however, declined only by about one percent initially and up to 8.9 perent in 1989.

The effect of the wage rate increase on employment in the wood industry is slight - from 2 to 7 percent. The change in the value added is almost a conetant 14 percent in the downward direction. Prices of wood producte steadily rose but only at a slow rate.

The increase in price of paper producte due to the increase in wage rate would reduce the demand for paper products, printing and publishing and coneequently a drap in supply by abouti 2 to 4 percent which in turn leads to a decilne in employment by about, 8 to 10 percent.

The chemical industry in the rural areas employ less then 20,000 people and an increase in wage rate. would reduce employment by only about 1.4 thousand or 8.05 percent of the baseline. Ae a result, value added would go down by about 2.1 percent.

The manufacture of petroleum and coal products in the rural areas employe the least number of workere among the RNE sectore and the reduction in the employment due to a.ten percent increase in wage rate is estimated to be lees, than 600 people. The effect on output would only be about 2 percent.

The impact on employment in machinery industries ranges from 2 to 6 percent on the negative side. Prices would increase by about 6.5 jercent leading to a drop in value added by approximately 14.7 percent.

The electrical induetry in the rural areas employe about 15 thousand people and if wage rate increase, smployment could go down by an average of about 11 percent while prices would rise by about 5.4 percent.

For all rural nonfarm enterprizes, a ten percent increase in wage rate ie estimated to result in a drop in employment by about 1.8 percent initially. Continuing wage increase would reduce employment by up to 7 percent. Aggregate value added from all RNEe would then decline by 1.1 to 4.2 percent.

\subsection*{7.2.2 Eiffeet of a Ten Peroent Peso Devaluation}

The immediate effect of an increase in the exchange rate of the peso'is to increase domestic prices of imported goods as well as locally produced goods. Thus inflationary trends would ensue. The increase in prices would tend to lower the demand for goods and services which would then reduce employment. The empirical results of the simulation exercise determining the effects of a ten percent devaluation on rural nonfarm enterprises generally conform with these expectations (Table 7.3). The only deviation observed is employment in the beverage and basic metals eectors which increased by a very small percentage of 0.46 percent and 0.56 percent respectively for the period 1984 to 1989.

Food prices increased by 7.73 percent 'which changee food output in the opposite direction by about two percent. Employment would also decline by about the same percentage.

The immediate effect of the devaluation on the tobacco induetry. in the rural areas is an increase. In employment and prices of manufactured tobacco. The latter probably outweighs the employment effect on output which decreaged by about 2 percent. As devaluation continuee, however, the number of workers employed is reduced due to wage increases and therefore output continued to fall.

Continuing devaluation has almost similar effects on value added, employment and prices in the textile. and wood industries in terms of direction of change and the rate at which. the percentage difference between the baseline solution and the shock run quantities change.

For the paper and paper producte RNE, the etability of the model is reflected by an almoet equal magnitude of change in output particularly between 1985 and 1989. Likewise, employment practicaliy changed by the same volume annually.

The largest impact of the devaluation on value added is observed in the machinery and electrical RNE eectors where the percentage difference between the baseline solution and that of the short-run averaged 20.44 percent and 12.91 percent respectively, for the period 1985-89. For employment the largest effect occurred in the textile induetry, with 7.0 percent, and machinery, with . 6.05 percent.

On the aggregate, the ten percent increase in the exchange rate reduced employment by an average of 3.64 percent over the period 1985 to 1989 and by 2.83 percent in value added over the same period.

\subsection*{7.2.3. Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports Equivalent to One Percent of GDP on the Baeeline}

Analyzing the impact of trade, trade policy and exterinal shock on the Philippine economy, Constantino and Yap (1988) state that given the structure of the PIDS NEDA macroeconometric model, the impact of higher manufactured exports on GDP will consist of the direct effect. through higher exports and output in manufacturing, and of the indirect effects working through the resulting changes in the money supply, prices, real interest rate (which will change due to the effect on inflation), and balance of payments and availability of foreign exchange to finance importe and inveetment.

An increase in exports would result in a more favorable balance of payments position, which eubsequently would increase the amount of forelgn exchange available to finance imports which are an important input in the, production of rural nonfarm enterprises.. Greater capacity to import would enhance investments and improve GDP growth. Theee changes would be expected to positively affect employment and output in rural nonfarn enterprises. Such change are validated in Table 7.4 which preeente the reeulte of the eimulation exercise which increasee-merchandiee exporte by an amount equivalent to one percent of GDP on the baseline. Thus, one observes increasee in volume added and in output. The magnitude of the difference between the baseline and the shock run appears relatively amaller that the previous two poliaies coneidered above. It would be recalled that some of the employemnt equatione in the RNE eubmodel included exports as an exogenous variable. Constantino and Yap (1988) however, indicatee that the macro model does not dietinguieh between manufactured and unmanufactured exporte.

The increase in merchandise exporte resulted in an increase in value added in the food RNEs by 1.00 percent and in the textile industries by 0.92 percent for the entire simulation period. The largest effecte were observed. in tobacco - 4.06 percent - and in machineries - 4.13 percent.

As a. whole, the initial effect of the increase in merchandiee exports on value added ie only 0.14 percent which increased to almost 2 percent in 1989. The change in employemnt is smaller and ranged from 0.11 percent in the firet year of the eimulation period to 1.26 percent in 1989.

Table 7.1. Root Mean Square Percent Error (RMSPE) for Grose Value Added, Employment, and Prices of Rurai
- Nonfarm Enterprieee, 1981-1989.
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Variable RMSPE & Variable RMSPE & Variable RMSPE \\
Gross Value \\
Added & Employment
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrlrllr} 
QFOOD & 8.81 & LFOOD & 14.67 & PFOOD & 4.43 \\
QBEV & 18.01 & LBEV & 7.15 & \(\therefore\) PBEV & 4.32 \\
QTOB & 32.98 & LTOB & 41.90 & PTOB & 9.18 \\
QTEX & 4.27 & LTEX & 13.34 & PTEX & 3.52 \\
QWOOD & 20.67 & LWOOD & 10.26 & PWOOD & 4.03 \\
QPAP & 15.68 & LPAP & 8.29 & PPAP & 5.95 \\
QCHEM & 19.63 & LCHEM & 11.97 & PCHEM & 9.18 \\
QPET & 5.67 & LPET & 30.39 & PPET & 16.87 \\
QBSM & 17.79 & LBSM & 9.68 & PBSM & 7.38 \\
QMACH & 12.20 & LMACH & 16.86 & PMACH & 5.27 \\
QELEC & 21.95 & LELEC & 19.90 & PELEC & 4.80 \\
QOTH & 5.37 & LOTH & 15.45 & POTH & 5.66 \\
QRNES & 5.87 & LRNES & 8.52 & PRNES & 5.96
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Wage Rate on Value Added, Employment, and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & \begin{tabular}{l}
Percentage \\
Difference
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QFOOD} & 1981 & 5143.00 & 5093.00 & -49.88 & -0.97 \\
\hline & 1982 & 5322.00 & 5219.00 & -102.98 & -1.94 \\
\hline & 1983 & 5246.00 & 5112.00 & -133. 32 & -2.54 \\
\hline & 1984 & 5615.00 & 5471.00 & -143.99 & -2.56 \\
\hline & 1985 & 5463.00 & 5317.00 & -145.39 & -2.66 \\
\hline & 1986 & 5680.00 & 5524.00 & -155.13 & -2.73 \\
\hline & 1987 & 5993.00 & 5829.00 & -163.80 & -2.73. \\
\hline & 1988 & 6362.00 & 6188:00 & -174.07 & -2.74 \\
\hline & 1989 & 6785.00 & 6597.00 & -188.02 & -2.77 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QBEV} & 1981 & 426.41 & 421.89 & -4.53 & -1.06 \\
\hline & 1982 & 460.35 & 449.85 & -10.50 & -2.28 \\
\hline & 1983 & . 476.19 & 462.14 & -14.05 & -2.95 \\
\hline & 1984 & 469.73 & 454.28 & -15.44 & -3.29 \\
\hline & 1985 & 466.59 & 450.67 & -15.92 & -3.41 \\
\hline & 1986 & 500.76 & 483.66 & -17.10 & -3.41 \\
\hline & 1987 & 549.79 & 531.53 & -18.26 & -3.32 \\
\hline & 1988 & 605.61 & 586.16 & -19.45 & -3.21 \\
\hline & 1989 & 667.03 & 646.05 & -20.97 & -3.14 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QTOB} & 1981 & 44.30 & 43.47 & -0.83 & -1.87 \\
\hline & 1982 & 44.18 & 42.41 & -1.77 & -4.01 \\
\hline & 1983 & 37.81 & 35.54 & -2.27 & -6.00 \\
\hline & 1984 & 29.00 & 26.60 & -2.40 & -8.27 \\
\hline & 1985_ & 22.70 & 20.32 & -2.39 & -10.53 \\
\hline & 1986 & 23.78 & 21.28 & -2.50 & -10.52 \\
\hline & 1987 & 27.03 & 24.43 & -2.60 & -9.62 \\
\hline & 1988 & 30.99 & 28.34 & -2.65 & -8.56 \\
\hline & 1989 & 35.62 & 32.85 & -2.77 & -7.77 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QTEX} & 1981 & 800.87 & '793.46 & -7.41 & -0.93 \\
\hline & 1982 & 855.84 & 841.38 & -14.46 & -1.69 \\
\hline & 1983 & 876.33 & 853.76 & -22.57 & -2.58 \\
\hline & 1984 & 818.00 & 782.14 & -35.85 & -4.38 \\
\hline & 1985 & 751.43 & 703.75 & -47.69 & -6.35 \\
\hline & 1986 & 760.64 & 704.08 & -56.56 & -7.44 \\
\hline & 1987 & 795.00 & 731.42 & -63.58 & -8.00 \\
\hline & 1988 & 822.59 & 752.42 & -70.17 & -8.53 \\
\hline & 1989 & 858.34 & 781.89 & -76.44 & -8.91 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Percent Increage in Wage Rate (Continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Bage Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QPAP} & 1981 & 269.77 & 264.83 & -4.94 & -1.83 \\
\hline & 1982 & 280.45 & 271.75 & -8.71 & -3.11 \\
\hline & 1983 & 283.00 & 272.29 & -10.71 & -3.78 \\
\hline & 1984 & 269.29 & 257.91 & -11.39 & -4.23 \\
\hline & 1985 & 258.81 & 247.54 & -11.26 & -4.35 \\
\hline & 1986 & 280.95 & 268.99 & -11.95 & -4.25 \\
\hline & 1987 & 309.16 & 296.57 & -12.60 & -4.07 \\
\hline & 1988 & 336.18 & 323.15 & -13.03 & -3.88 \\
\hline & 1989 & \[
367.74
\] & 354.05 & -13.69 & -3.72 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QWOOD} & 1981 & 651.54 & 636.02 & \(-15.52\) & -2.38 \\
\hline & 1982 & 691.63 & 660.98 & -30.65 & -4.43 \\
\hline & 1983 & 665.36 & 622.81 & -42.55 & -6.40 \\
\hline & 1984 & . 624.45 & 568.33 & -56.12 & -8.99 \\
\hline & 1985 & 496.20 & 429.92 & -66.27 & -13.36 \\
\hline & 1986 & 508.30 & 433.56 & -74.74 & -14.70 \\
\hline & 1987 & 557.62 & 476.23 & -81.39 & -14.60 \\
\hline & 1988 & 596.59 & 509:00 & -87.59 & \(-14.68\) \\
\hline & 1989 & 651.73 & 557.50 & -94.23 & -14.46 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QPET} & 1981 & 1366.00 & 1359.00 & \(-7.02\) & -0.51 \\
\hline & 1982 & 1373.00 & 1356.00 & -17.35 & -1.26 \\
\hline & 1983 & 1405.00 & 1380.00 & -24.75 & -1.76 \\
\hline & 1984 & 1320.00 & 1292.00 & -28.42 & -2.15 \\
\hline & 1985 & 1242.00 & 1212.00 & -29.78 & -2.40 \\
\hline & 1986 & 1253.00 & 1221.00 & -31.86 & -2.54 \\
\hline & 1987 & 1301.00 & 1267.00 & -34.02 & -2.62 \\
\hline & 1988 & 1373.00 & 1337.00 & -36.45 & -2.65 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1464.00 & 1424.00 & -39.50 & -2.70 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QCHEM} & 1981 & 574.86 & 571.52. & -3.33 & -0.58 \\
\hline & 1982 & 549.24 & 543.45 & -5.79 & -1.05 \\
\hline & 1983 & 793.75 & 785.58 & -8.17 & -1.03 \\
\hline & 1984 & 559.12 & 547.42 & -11.70 & -2.09 \\
\hline & 1985 & 491.18 & 477.23 & -13.95 & -2.84 \\
\hline & 1986 & 593.38 & 577.84 & -15.54 & -2.62 \\
\hline & 1987 & 584.12 & 567.26 & -16.87 & -2.89 \\
\hline & 1988 & 610.91 & 592.66 & -18.24 & -2.99 \\
\hline & 1989 & 603.23 & 583.59 & -19.64 & -3.26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Wage Rate (Continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shoek Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QMACH} & 1981 & 444.82 & 432.62 & -12.19 & -2.74 \\
\hline & 1982 & 424.86 & 403.69 & - 21.17 & -4.98 \\
\hline & 1983 & 386.28 & 357.76 & -28.52 & -7.38 \\
\hline & 1984 & 268.60 & 231.30 & -37.30 & -13.89 \\
\hline & 1985 & 194.44 & 151.63 & -42.82 & -22.02 \\
\hline & 1986 & 222.86 & 174.89 & -47.97 & -21.53 \\
\hline & 1987 & 253.60 & 201.62 & -51.99 & -20.50 \\
\hline & 1988 & 276.19 & 219.72 & -56.48 & -20.45 \\
\hline & 1989 & 316.76 & 255.55 & -61.21 & -19.32 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QELEC} & 1981 & 184.05 & 172.36 & -11.69 & -6. 35 \\
\hline & 1982 & 228.35 & 209.90 & -18.45 & -8.08 \\
\hline & 1983 & 339.04 & 311.32 & -27.72 & -8.18 \\
\hline & 1984 & . 345.95 & 300.64 & -45.31 & -13.10 \\
\hline & 1985 & 458.12 & 400.84 & -57.28 & -12.50 \\
\hline & 1986 & 583.44 & 518.53 & -64.91 & -11.13 \\
\hline & 1987 & 658.09 & 586.80 & -71.30 & -10.83 \\
\hline & 1988 & 707.02 & 628.88 & -78.14 & -11.05 \\
\hline & 1989 & 770.64 & 686.05 & -84.60 & \(-10.98\) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QOTH} & 1981 & 506.69 & 499.22 & -7.47 & -1.47 \\
\hline & 1982 & 516.88 & 500.33 & -16.55 & -3.20 \\
\hline & 1983 & 526.51 & 505.25 & -21.26 & -4.04 \\
\hline & 1984 & 519.00 & 496.42 & -22.58 & \(-4.35\) \\
\hline & 1985 & 486.16 & 462.89 & -23.28 & -4.79 \\
\hline & 1986 & 512.10 & 487.37 & -24.73 & -4.83 \\
\hline & 1987 & 576.55 & 550.22 & -26.33 & -4.57 \\
\hline & 1988 & 645.90 & 618.82 & -27.08 & -4.19 \\
\hline & 1989 & 724.99 & 697.05 & -27.94 & -3.85 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LFOOD} & 1981 & 170.94 & 169.35 & -1.59 & -0.93 \\
\hline & 1982 & 178.27 & 175.00 & -3.27 & -1.83 \\
\hline & 1983 & 185.39 & 181.17 & -4.23 & -2.28 \\
\hline & 1984 & 174.96 & 170.39 & -4.57 & -2.61 \\
\hline & 1985 & 167.09 & 162.45 & -4.65 & -2.78 \\
\hline & 1986 & 175.93 & 170.95 & -4.98 & -2.83 \\
\hline & 1987 & 184.62 & 179.35 & -5.26 & -2.85 \\
\hline & 1988 & 203.12 & 197.53 & -5.60 & -2.76 \\
\hline & 1989 & 213.45 & 207.41 & -6.05 & -2.83 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Percent Increase In Wage Rate (Continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Base } \\
& \text { Run. }
\end{aligned}
\] & Shook Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LBEV} & 1981 & 18.73 & 16.79 & -1.94 & -10.36 \\
\hline & 1982 & 18.84 & 15.95 & -2.89 & -15.36 \\
\hline & 1983 & 20.31 & 17.48 & -2.83 & -13.93 \\
\hline & 1984 & 22.25 & 19.85 & -2.40 & -10.77 \\
\hline & 1985 & 20.49 & 17.90 & -2.59 & -12.64 \\
\hline & 1986 & 19.44 & 16.56 & -2.88 & -14.81 \\
\hline & 1987 & 19.70 & 16.73 & -2.98 & -15.11 \\
\hline & 1988 & 20.09 & 17.11 & -2.98 & -14.84 \\
\hline & 1989 & 20.11 & 17.12 & -3.00 & -14.90 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LTOB} & 1981 & 2.48 & 3.01 & 0.53 & 21.26 \\
\hline & 1982 & 2.32 & 2.99 & 0.67 & 29.02 \\
\hline & 1983 & 2.66 & 3.33 & 0.66 & 24.82 \\
\hline & 1984 & 3.01 & 3.59 & 0.57 & 19.05 \\
\hline & 1985 & 2.57 & 3.14 & 0.57 & 22.17 \\
\hline & 1986 & 2.03 & 2.67 & 0.63 & 31.12 \\
\hline & 1987 & 2.23 & 2.87 & 0.64 & 28.58 \\
\hline & 1988 & 2.20 & 2.83 & 0.64 & 28.94 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1.95 & 2.60 & 0.64 & 32.84 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LTEX} & 1981 & 137.24 & 131.41 & -5.84 & -4.25 \\
\hline & 1982 & 136.25 & 126.59 & -9.66 & -7.0.9 \\
\hline & 1983 & 134.32 : & 122.33 & -12.00 & -8.93 \\
\hline & 1984 & 125.37 & 110.52 & -14.85 & -11.85 \\
\hline & 1985 & 110.57 & 91.18 & -19.39 & -17.53 \\
\hline & 1986 & 102.58 & 79.29 & -23.29 & -22.71 \\
\hline & 1987 & 102.21 & 76.22 & -25.99 & -25.43 \\
\hline & 1988 & 99.85 & 71.52 & -28.34 & -28.38 \\
\hline & 1989 & 95.24 & 64.53 & -30.72 & -32.25 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{10}{*}{LPAP} & & & & & \\
\hline & 1981 & 12.99 & 12.29 & \(-0.70\) & -5.41 \\
\hline & 1982 & 13.07 & 11.99 & -1.08 & -8.24 \\
\hline & 1983 & 13.55 & 12.45 & -1.10 & -8.12 \\
\hline & 1984 & 11.17 & 10.19. & -0.98 & -8.77 \\
\hline & 1985 & 10.68 & \(9.64{ }^{\circ}\) & -1.04 & -9.73 \\
\hline & 1986 & 10.88 & 9.73 & -1.14 & -10.52 \\
\hline & 1987 & 11.50 & 10.31 & -1.19 & -10.33 \\
\hline & 1988 & 12.09 & 10.89 & -1.20 & -9.92 \\
\hline & 1989 & 12.72 & 11.51 & -1.22 & -9.57 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Percent \(\operatorname{Lncrease}\) in Wage Rate (Continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Babe Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LWOOD} & 1981 & 93.01 & 91.05 & -1.96 & -2.11 \\
\hline & 1982 & 88.89 & 85.80 & -3.09 & -3.48 \\
\hline & 1983 & 80.93 & 77:36 & -3.57 & -4.41 \\
\hline & 1984 & 82.83 & 78.72 & -4.11 & -4.96 \\
\hline & 1985 & 73.66 & 68.48 & -5.18 & -7.04 \\
\hline & 1986 & 82.54 & 78.02 & -4.52 & -5.48 \\
\hline & 1987 & 91.84 & 88.70 & -3.14 & -3.42 \\
\hline & 1988 & 95.45 & 92.95 & -2.51 & -2.63 \\
\hline & 1989 & 88.93 & 97.00 & -1.92 & -1.94 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LPET} & 1981 & 2.63 & 2.26 & -0.37 & -14.17 \\
\hline & 1982 & 2.47 & 1.87 & -0.60 & -24.36 \\
\hline & 1983 & 2.99 & 2.39 & -0.60 & -20.06 \\
\hline & 1984 & 3.38 & 2.86 & -0.52 & -15.29 \\
\hline & 1985 & 2.89 & 2.32 & -0.57 & -19.81 \\
\hline & 1986 & 2.53 & 1.90 & -0.64 & -25.10 \\
\hline & 1987 & 2.71 & 2.04 & -0.66 & -24.55 \\
\hline & 1988 & 2.84 & 2.17 & -0.67 & -23.62 \\
\hline & 1989 & 2.89 & 2.21 & -0.68 & -23.42 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LCHEM} & 1981 & 16.90 & 15.93 & \(-0.97\) & -5.74 \\
\hline & 1982 & 16.53 & 15.12 & -1.41 & -8.54 \\
\hline & 1983 & 19.90 & 18.48 & -1.42 & -7.12 \\
\hline & 1984 & 17.36 & 16.09 & -1.27 & -7.30 \\
\hline & 1985. & 16.59 & 15.22 & -1.37 & -8.27 \\
\hline & 1986 & 17.66 & 16.13 & -1.53 & -8.64 \\
\hline & 1987 & 17.66 & 16.07 & -1.59 & -8.98 \\
\hline & 1988 & 18.02 & 16.41 & -1.61 & -8.91 \\
\hline & 1989 & 17.87 & 16.25 & -1.63 & -9.11 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LBSM} & 1981 & 6.55 & 4.72 & -1.82 & -27.84 \\
\hline & 1982 & 6.56 & 3.93 & -2.63 & -40.03 \\
\hline & 1983 & 7.33 & 4.75 & \(-2.58\) & -35.19 \\
\hline & 1984 & 8.00 & 5.79 & -2.20 & -27.55 \\
\hline & 1985 & 8.28 & 5.93 & -2.35 & -28.38 \\
\hline & 1986 & 8.05 & 5.43 & -2.61 & -32.50 \\
\hline & 1987 & 8.36 & 5.66 & -2.70 & -32.29 \\
\hline & 1988 & 8.51 & 5.81 & -2.70 & -31.77 \\
\hline & 1989 & 8.49 & 5.78 & -2.72 & -31.99 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Wage Rate (Continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LMACH} & 1981 & 27.37 & 26.85 & -0.52 & -1.90 \\
\hline & 1982 & 29.73 & 28.92 & -0.81 & -2.72 \\
\hline & 1983 & 25.61 & 24.54 & -1.07 & -4.19 \\
\hline & 1984 & 32.91 & 31.51 & -1.40 & -4.25 \\
\hline & 1985 & 28.71 & 27.13 & -1.58 & -5.49 \\
\hline & 1986 & 30.29 & 28.52 & -1.77 & -5.83 \\
\hline & 1987 & 29.19 & 27.29 & -1.90 & -6.52 \\
\hline & 1988 & 33.05 & 30.98 & -2.07 & -6.26 \\
\hline & 1989 & 32.05 & 29.81 & -2.24 & -7.00 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LELEC} & 1981 & 6.41 & 6.12 & -0.29 & -4.48 \\
\hline & 1982 & 6.51 & 5.93 & -0.58 & -8.92 \\
\hline & 1983. & 6.95 & 6.15 & -0.81 & -11.58 \\
\hline & 1984. & 7.02 & 6.04 & -0.99 & -14.07 \\
\hline & 1985 & 7.55 & 6.43 & -1.12 & -14.78 \\
\hline & 1986 & \(9.39{ }^{\prime}\) & 8.14 & -1.25 & -13.28 \\
\hline & 1987 & 11.49 & 10.11 & -1.38 & -12.01 \\
\hline & 1988 & 13.78 & 12.28 & -1.50 & -10.88 \\
\hline & 1989 & 14.07 & 12.47 & -1.60 & -11.36 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LOTH} & 1981 & 30.80 & 36.79 & 5.99 & 19.43 \\
\hline & 1982 & 31.67 & 41.62 & 9.95 & 31.41 \\
\hline & 1983 & 27.21 & 37.81 & 10.60 & 38.94 \\
\hline & 1984 & 27.00 & 36.42 & 9.42 & 34.89 \\
\hline & 1985 & 28.54 & 38.41 & 9.87 & 34.60 \\
\hline & 1986 & 34.50 & 45.51 & 11.01 & 31.90 \\
\hline & 1987 & 36.79 & 48.39 & 11.60 & 31.53 \\
\hline & 1988 & 36.60 & 48.33 & 11.74 & 32.07 \\
\hline & 1989 & 36.71 & 48.51 & 11.79 & 32.12 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PFOOD} & 1981 & 273.02 & 282.27 & 9.25 & 3.39 \\
\hline & 1982 & 297.41 & 312.01 & 14.60 & 4.91 \\
\hline & 1983 & 368.45 & 390.39 & 21.94 & 5.95 \\
\hline & 1984 & 527.52 & 563.38 & 35.85 & 6.80 \\
\hline & 1985 & 663.18 & 708.50 & 45.33 & 6.83 \\
\hline & 1986 & 698.83 & 750.20 & 51.37 & 7.35 \\
\hline & 1987 & 738.15 & 794.57 & 56.42 & 7:64 \\
\hline & 1988. & 798.85 & 860.68 & 61.83 & 7.74 \\
\hline & 1989 & 847.12 & 914.06 & 66.94 & 7.90 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Wage Rate (Continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Babe Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PBEV} & 1981 & 364.13 & 368.91 & 4.78 & 1.31 \\
\hline & 1982 & 394.49 & 404.27 & 9.78 & 2.48 \\
\hline & 1983 & 445.42 & 461;33 & 15.92 & 3.57 \\
\hline & 1984 & 551.46 & 577.44 & 25.98 & 4.71 \\
\hline & 1985 & 671.20 & 706.79 & 35.58 & 5.30 : \\
\hline & 1986 & 745.67 & 788.88 & 43.20 & 5.79 . \\
\hline & 1987 & 800.85 & 850.23 & 49.38 & 6.17 \\
\hline & 1988 & 858.05 & 913.11 & 55.06 & 6.42 \\
\hline & 1989 & 909.76 & 970.13 & 60.37 & 6.64 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PTOB} & 1981 & 269.16 & 274.95 & 5.79 & 2.15 \\
\hline & 1982 & 301.13 & 312.93 & 11.80 & 3.92 \\
\hline & 1983 & 360.29 & 379.45 & 19.15 & 5.32 \\
\hline & 1984 & . 487.05 & 518.29 & 31.24 & 6.41 \\
\hline & 1985 & 630.19. & 672.91 & 42.72 & 6.78 \\
\hline & 1986 & 718.25 & 770.03 & 51.78 & 7.21 \\
\hline & 1987 & 783.32 & 842.42 & 59.10 & 7.54 \\
\hline & 1988 & 851.20 & 917.05 & 65.85 & 7.74 \\
\hline & 1989 & 9.12 .59 & 984.75 & 72.15 & 7.91 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PTEX} & 1981 & 427.12 & 435.66 & 8.54 & 2.00 \\
\hline & 1982 & 465.04 & 481.64 & 16.59 & 3.57 \\
\hline & 1983 & 544.46 & 570.77 & 26.30 & 4.83 \\
\hline & 1984 & 720.28 & 762.97 & 42.69 & 5.93 \\
\hline & 1985 & 909.58 & 966.98 & 57.40 & 6.31 \\
\hline & 1986 & 1011.00 & 1080.00 & 68.34 & 6.76 \\
\hline & 1987 & 1085.00 & 1162.00 & 76.99 & 7.10 \\
\hline & 1988 & 1168.00 & 1253.00 & 85.13 & 7.29 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1242.00 & 1335.00 & 92.82 & 7.47 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PPAP} & 1981 & 303.89 & 313.41 & 9.53 & 3.13 \\
\hline & 1982 & 329.01 & 344.04. & 15.04 & 4.57 \\
\hline & 1983 & 402.17 & 424.76 & 22.59 & 5.62 \\
\hline & 1984 & 565.98 & 602.90 & 36.92 & 6.52 \\
\hline & 1985 & 705.67 & 752.35 & 46.68 & 6.61 \\
\hline & 1986 & 742.39 & 795.29 & 52.90 & 7.13 \\
\hline & 1987 & 782.89 & 840.98 & 58.10 & 7.42 \\
\hline & 1988 & 845.39 & 909.07 & 63.67 & 7.53 \\
\hline & 1989 & 895.09 & 964.03 & 68.94 & 7.70 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Wage Rate (Continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & Pexcentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PWOOD} & 1981 & 367.98 & 374.89 & 6.91 & 1.88 \\
\hline & 1982 & 395.18 & 408.04 & 12.86 & 3.25 \\
\hline & 1983 & 455.94 & 475.85 & 20.02 & 4.39 \\
\hline & 1984 & 591.91 & 624.34 & 32.43 & 5.48 \\
\hline & 1985 & 731.62 & 774.64 & 43.01 & 5.88 \\
\hline & 1986 & 797.70 & 848.21 & 50.51 & 6.33 \\
\hline & 1987 & 845.72 & 902.12 & 56.40 & 6.67 \\
\hline & 1988 & 904.62 & 966.72 & 62.11 & 6.87 \\
\hline & 1989 & 957.29 & 1025.00 & 67.54 & 7.05 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PPET} & 1981 & 758.85 & 762.32 & 3.47 & 0.46 \\
\hline & 1982 & 814.91 & 822.92 & 8.01. & 0.98 \\
\hline & 1983 & 882.45 & 896.52 & 14.08 & 1.60 \\
\hline & 1984 & . 991.39 & 1015.00 & 23.72 & 2.39 \\
\hline & 1985 & 1122.00 & 1156.00 & 34.30 & 3.06 \\
\hline & 1986 & 1230.00 & 1274.00 & 44.29 & 3.60 \\
\hline & 1987 & 1324.00 & 1377.00 & 53.46 & 4.04 \\
\hline & 1988 & 1415.00 & 1477.00 & 62.18 & 4.39 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1500.00 & 1570.00 & 70.46 & 4.70 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PCHEM} & 1981 & 285.97 & 294.98 & 9.01 & 3.15 \\
\hline & 1982 & 309.74 & 323.97 & 14.23 & 4.59 \\
\hline & 1983 & 378.97 & 400.35 & 21.38 & 5.64 \\
\hline & 1984 & 533.99 & 568.93 & 34.94 & 6.54 \\
\hline & 1985 & 666.19 & 710.36 & 44.17 & 6.63 \\
\hline & 1986 & 700.94 & 750.99 & 50.06 & 7.14 \\
\hline & 1987 & 739.25 & 794.23 & 54.98 & 7.44 \\
\hline & 1988 & 798.41 & 858.66 & 60.25 & 7.55 \\
\hline & 1989 & 845.44 & 910.67 & 65.24 & 7.72 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PBSM} & 1981 & 245.92 & 251.33 & 5.41 & 2.20 \\
\hline & 1982 & 270.37 & 280.99 & 10.62 & 3.93 \\
\hline & 1983 & 321.33 & 338.25 & .16.92 & 5.27 \\
\hline & 1984 & 433.99 & 461.47 & 27.48 & 6.33 \\
\hline & 1985 & 556.65 & 593.72 & 37.08 & 6.66 \\
\hline & 1986 & 624.63 & 668.93 & 44.30 & 7.09 \\
\hline & 1987 & 673.76 & 723.79 & 50.03 & 7.43 \\
\hline & 1988 & 728.15 & 783.55 & 55.40 & 7.61 \\
\hline & 1989 & 777.29 & 837.74 & 60.45 & 7.78 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Fercent Increase in Wage Rate (Continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & \begin{tabular}{l}
Percentage \\
Difference
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PMACH} & 1981 & 184.08 & . 190.35 & 6.26 & 3.40 \\
\hline & 1982 & 231.92 & 243.21 & 11.29 & 4.87 \\
\hline & 1983 & 290.73 & 308.11 & 17.38 & 5.98 \\
\hline & 1984 & 411.59 & 439.75 & 28.16 & 6.84 \\
\hline & 1985 & 530.48 & 567.47 & 36.99 & 6.97 \\
\hline & 1986 & 581.23 & 624.28 & 43.06 & 7.41 \\
\hline & 1987 & 619.20 & 667.04 & 47.83 & 7.72 \\
\hline & 1988 & 668.80 & 721.37 & 52.57 & 7.86 \\
\hline & 1989 & 712.57 & 769.66 & 57.08 & 8.01 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PELEC} & 1981 & 198.35 & 203.10 & 4.75 & 2.40 \\
\hline & 1982 & 210.88 & 218.38 & 7.50 & 3.56 \\
\hline & 1983 & 247.38 & 258.66 & 11.27 & 4.56 \\
\hline & 1984 & - 329.12 & 347.54 & 18.42 & 5.60 \\
\hline & 1985 & 398.81 & 422.10 & 23.29 & 5.84 \\
\hline & 1986 & 417.14 & 443.53 & 26.39 & 6.33 \\
\hline & 1.987 & 437.34 & 466.33 & 28.99 & 6.63 \\
\hline & 1988 & 468.53 & 500.30 & 31.77 & 6.78 \\
\hline & 1989 & 493.32 & 527.72 & 34.40 & 6.97 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{POTH} & 1981 & 364.03 & 373.42 & 9.38 & 2.58 \\
\hline & 1982 & 402.03 & 419.68 & 17.65 & 4.39 \\
\hline & 1983 & 485.58 & 513.16 & 27.59 & 5.68 \\
\hline & 1984 & 672.18 & 716.88 & 44.71 & 6.65 \\
\hline & 1985 & 866.18 & 925.67 & 59.49 & 6.87 \\
\hline & 1986 & 961.00 & 1031.00 & 70.08 & 7.29 \\
\hline & 1987 & 1030.00 & 1108.00 & 78.41 & 7.62 \\
\hline & 1988 & 1112.00 & 1198.00 & 86.42 & 7.77 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1186.00 & 1280.00 & 94.02 & 7.93 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QRNES} & 1981 & 11271:00 & 11146.00 & \(-124.82\) & -1.11 \\
\hline & 1982 & 11688.00 & 11440.00 & -248.37 & -2.13 \\
\hline & 1983 & 12061.00 & 11725.00 & -335.90 & \(-2.79\) \\
\hline & 1984 & 11950.00 & 11540.00 & -410.50 & -3.44 \\
\hline & 1985 & 11529.00 & 11073.00 & -456.02 & -3.96 \\
\hline & 1986 & 12206.00 & 11703.00 & -503.00 & -4.12 \\
\hline & 1987 & 12983.00 & 12440.00 & -542.73 & -4.18 \\
\hline & 1988 & 13835.00 & 13252.00 & -583.36 & -4.22 \\
\hline & 1989 & 14804.00 & 14175.00 & -629.01 & -4.25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.2. Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Wage Rate (Continued).
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Variable & Year & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Base \\
Run
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Shock \\
Run
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Difference
\end{tabular} \\
LRNES & & & & \\
Difference
\end{tabular}

Table 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Exchange Rate on Employment, Value Added and Prices of RNES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QFOOD} & 1981 & 5143 & 5084. & -59.73 & -1.16 \\
\hline & 1982 & 5322 & 5204 & -118.19 & -2.22 \\
\hline & 1983 & 5246 & 5110 & -136.05 & -2.59 \\
\hline & 1984 & 5615 & 5486 & -128.81 & -2.29 \\
\hline & 1985 & 5463 & 5344 & -118.81 & -2.17 \\
\hline & 1986 & 5680 & 5561 & -118.74 & -2.09 \\
\hline & 1987 & 5993 & 5876 & -116.59 & -1.94 \\
\hline & 1988 & 6362 & 6246 & -116.46 & -1.83 \\
\hline & 1989 & 6785 & 6666 & -118:92 & -1.75 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QBEV} & 1981 & 426 & 422 & -4.05 & -0.95 \\
\hline & 1982 & 460 & 449 & -10.37 & -2.25 \\
\hline & 1983 & 476 & 463 & -12.71. & -2.67 \\
\hline & 1984 & 469 & 457 & -12.58 & -2.68 \\
\hline & 1985. & . 466 & 454 & -11.82 & -2.53 \\
\hline & 1986 & 500 & 488 & -12.01 & -2.40 \\
\hline & 1987 & 549 & 537 & -12.13 & -2.21 \\
\hline & 1988 & 605 & 593 & -12.17 & -2.01 \\
\hline & 1989 & 667 & 654 & -12.50 & -1.87 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QTOB} & 1981 & 44.29 & 43.45 & -0.84 & -1.90 \\
\hline & 1982. & 44.18 & 42.35 & -1.82 & -4.13 \\
\hline & 1983 & 37.81 & 35.77 & . -2.04 & -5.39 \\
\hline & 1984 & 28.99 & 27.18 & -1.81 & -6.26 \\
\hline & 1985 & 22.70 & 21.16 & -1.54 & -6.80 \\
\hline & 1986 & 23.78 & 22.33 & -1.45 & -6.09 \\
\hline & 1987. & 27.03 & -25.70 & -1.33 & -4.83 \\
\hline & 1988 & 30.99 & 29.83 & -1.16 & -3.74 \\
\hline & 1989 & 35.62 & 34.58 & -1.04 & -2.92 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QTEX} & 1981 & 800 & 789 & -10.88 & -1.35 \\
\hline & 1982 & 855 & 836 & -19.04 & -2.22 \\
\hline & 1983 & 876 & 848 & -28.08 & -3.20 \\
\hline & 1984 & 817 & 755 & -42.97 & -5.25 \\
\hline & 1985 & 851 & 693 & -57.76 & -7.69 \\
\hline & 1986 & 760 & 694 & -66.45. & -8.74 \\
\hline & 1987 & 794 & 722. & -72.04 & -9.06 \\
\hline & 1988 & 922 & 745 & -77.26 & -9.39 \\
\hline & 1989 & 858 & 776 & -81.55 & -9.50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent. Increase in Exchange Rate (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock
Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline & 1984 & 624 & 566 & -57.70 & -9.24 \\
\hline & 1985 & 496 & 428 & -68.07 & -13.72 \\
\hline & 1986 & 508 & 434 & . 73.96 & -14.55 \\
\hline & 1987 & 557 & 480 & -76.89 & -13.79 \\
\hline & 1988 & 596 & 516 & -79.62 & -13.35 \\
\hline & 1989 & 651 & 569 & -82.07 & -12.59 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QPAP} & 1981 & 269 & 265 & -4.67 & \(-1.73\) \\
\hline & 1982 & - 280 & 272 & -7.54 & -2.60 \\
\hline & 1983 & 282 & 274 & -8.62 & -3.05 \\
\hline & 1984 & 269 & 260 & -8.53 & -3.17 \\
\hline & 1985 & 258 & 250 & -7.84 & . -3.03 \\
\hline & 1986 & 280 & 273 & -7.85 & -2.70 \\
\hline & 1987 & 309 & 301 & -7.98 & -2.58 \\
\hline & 1988 & 336 & 328 & -7.71 & -2.29 \\
\hline & 1989 & 367 & 360 & -7.73 & \(-2.10\) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QCHEM} & 1981. & 574 & 570 & -4.59 & -0.80 \\
\hline & 1982 & 549 & 542 & -7.07 & -1.28 \\
\hline & 1983 & 793 & 784 & -9.30 & -1.17 \\
\hline & 1984 & 559 & 546 & -12.80 & -2.29 \\
\hline & 1985 & 491 & 475 & -15.50 & -3.16 \\
\hline & 1986 & 593 & 576 & -16.42 & -2.77 \\
\hline & 1987 & 584 & 567 & -17.04 & -2.92 \\
\hline & 1988 & 610 & 593 & -17.88 & -2.93 \\
\hline & 1989 & 603 & 584 & -18.51 & -3.07 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QPET} & & 1366 & 1359 & & -0.51 \\
\hline & 1982 & 1373 & 1355 & -17.99 & -1.31 \\
\hline & 1983 & 1405 & 1381 & -23.59 & -1.68 \\
\hline & 1984 & 1320 & 1296 & \(-24.29\) & -1.84 \\
\hline & 1985 & 1242 & 1219 & -23.10 & -1.86 \\
\hline & 1986 & 1253 & 1230 & -23.08 & -1.84 \\
\hline & 1987 & 1301 & 1278 & -23.09 & -1.78 \\
\hline & 1988 & 1373 & 1350 & -23.30 & -1.70 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1464 & 1440 & -23.98 & -1.64 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Exchange Rate (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & \begin{tabular}{l}
Base \\
Run
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Shock \\
Run
\end{tabular} & Difference & \begin{tabular}{l}
Percentage \\
DIfference
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QMACH} & 1981 & 444 & 428 & - -16.20 & -3.64 \\
\hline & 1982 & 424 & 399 & -25.57 & -6.02 \\
\hline & 1983 & 386 & 354 & -31.68 & -8.20 \\
\hline & 1984 & 268 & 229 & -39.38 & -14.66 \\
\hline & 1985 & 194 & 148 & -45.62 & -23.46 \\
\hline & 1986 & 222 & 174 & -48.79 & -21.89 \\
\hline & 1987 & 253 & 202 & -50.65 & -19.97 \\
\hline & 1988 & 276 & 222 & -53.33 & -19.31 \\
\hline & 1989 & 316 & 261 & -55.60 & -17.55 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QELEC} & 1981 & 184 & 166 & -17.46 & -9.49 \\
\hline & 1982 & 228 & 204 & -23.95 & -10.49 \\
\hline & 1983 & 339 & 304 & -34.43 & -10.16 \\
\hline & 1984 & 345 & 291 & -54.48 & -15.75 \\
\hline & 1985 & 458 & 387. & -70.60 & -15.41 \\
\hline & 1986 & 583 & 507 & -76.23 & -13.07 \\
\hline & 1987 & 658 & 577 & -80.46 & -12.22 \\
\hline & 1988 & 707 & 621 & -86.00 & -12.16 \\
\hline & 1989 & 770 & 680 & -90.11 & -11.69 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QOTH} & 1981 & 506 & 502 & -4.62 & -0.91 \\
\hline & 1982 & 516 & 504 & -12.54 & -2.43 \\
\hline & 1983. & 526 & 510 & -15.70 & -2.99 \\
\hline & 1984 & 519 & 502 & -16.11 & -3.10 \\
\hline & 1985 & 486 & 470 & -15.47 & -3.18 \\
\hline & 1986 & 512 & 496 & -15.95 & -3.11 \\
\hline & 1987 & 576 & 559 & -16.87. & -2.93 \\
\hline & 1988 & 645 & 629 & -16.13 & -2.50 \\
\hline & 1989 & 724 & 709 & -15.95 & -2.20 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{10}{*}{LFOOD} & & & & & \\
\hline & 1981 & 170 & 169 & -1.86 & -1.09 \\
\hline & 1982 & 178 & 174 & -3.69 & -2.07 \\
\hline & 1983 & 185 & 181 & -4.24 & -2.29 \\
\hline & 1984 & 174 & 170 & -4.02 & -2.30 \\
\hline & 1985 & 167 & 163 & -3.72 & -2.22 \\
\hline & 1986 & 175 & 172 & -3.72 & -2.11 \\
\hline & 1987 & 184 & 180 & -3.66 & -1.98 \\
\hline & 1988 & 203 & 199 & -3.65 & \(-1.80\) \\
\hline & 1989 & 213 & 209 & -3.73 & -1.75 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
'able 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Exchange Rate (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 'artable & Year & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Base } \\
& \text { Run }
\end{aligned}
\] & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{BEV} & 1981 & 18.73 & 19.13 & 0.39 & 2.09 \\
\hline & 1982 & 18.84 & 19.05 & 0.21 & 1:12 \\
\hline & 1983 & 20.31 & 20.50 & 0.18 & 0.90 \\
\hline & 1984 & 22.25 & 22.39 & 0.14 & \(0.64{ }^{\text { }}\) \\
\hline & 1985 & 20.49 & 20.61 & 0.12 & 0.59 \\
\hline & 1986 & 19.44 & 19.54 & 0.10 & 0.52 \\
\hline & 1987 & 19.70 & 19.77 & 0.06 & 0.33 \\
\hline & 1988 & 20.08 & 20.17 & 0.07 & 0.38 \\
\hline & 1989 & 20.11 & 20.17 & 0.06 & 0.32 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{TOB} & 1981 & 2.48 & 2.60 & 0.12 & 4.85 \\
\hline & 1982 & 2.32 & 2.32 & 0.00 & 0.15 \\
\hline & 1983 & 2.66 & 2.66 & -0.00 & -0.23 \\
\hline & 1984 & 3.01 & 3.01 & -0.00 & -0.19 \\
\hline & 1985 & 2.57 & 2.53 & -0.04 & -1.69 \\
\hline & 1986 & 2.03 & 1.98 & -0.06 & -2.71 \\
\hline & 1987 & 2.23 & 2.15 & -0.08 & -3.52 \\
\hline & 1988 & 2.20 & 2.12 & -0.07 & -3.36 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1.95 & 1.89 & -0.07 & -3.41 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{IEX} & 1981 & 137 & 136 & & -0.33 \\
\hline & 1982 & 136 & 134 & -1.75 & -1.28 \\
\hline & 1983 & 134 & 131 & -2.56 & -1.91 \\
\hline & 1984 & 125 & 121 & -3.79 & -3.02 \\
\hline & 1985 & 110 & 105 & -5.48 & -4.96 \\
\hline & 1986 & 102 & 95 & -6.64 & -6.48 \\
\hline & 1987 & 102 & 94 & -7.26 & -7.10 \\
\hline & 1988 & 99 & 92 & -7.73 & -7.74 \\
\hline & 1989 & 95 & 86 & -8.31 & \(-8.73\) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{WOOD} & 1981 & 93:01 & 91.14 & -1.87 & -2.01 \\
\hline & 1982 & 88.89 & 86.43 & -2.46 & -2.76 \\
\hline & 1983 & 80.93 & 78.57 & -2.36 & -2.92 \\
\hline & 1984 & 82.83 & 80.17 & -2.66 & -3.21 \\
\hline & 1985 & 73.66 & 69.85 & -3.81 & -5.18 \\
\hline & 1986 & 82.54 & 79.83 & -2.71 & -3.29 \\
\hline & 1987 & 91.84 & 90.92 & -0.92 & -1.01 \\
\hline & 1988 & 95.45 & 95.28 & -0.17 & -0.18 \\
\hline & 1989 & 98.93 & 99.41 & 0.49 & 0.49 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Exchange Rate (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Bace Ran & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LPAP} & 1981 & 12.99 & 13.03 & 0.03 & 0.26 \\
\hline & 1982 & 13.07 & 12.98 & -0.08 & -0.61 \\
\hline & 1983 & 13.55 & 13.44 & -0.11 & -0.86 \\
\hline & 1984 & 11.16 & 11.04 & -0.13 & -1.15 \\
\hline & 1985 & 10.68 & 10.56 & -0.12 & -1.15 \\
\hline & 1986 & 10.88 & 10.75 & -0.13 & -1.19 \\
\hline & 1987 & 11.50 & 11.36 & -0.14 & -1.25 \\
\hline & 1988 & 12.09 & 11.96 & -0.13 & -1.11 \\
\hline & 1989 & 12.72 & 12.58 & -0.13 & -1.09 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LCHEM} & 1981 & 16.90 & 16.94 & 0.04 & 0.25 \\
\hline & 1982 & 16.53 & 16.52 & -0.01 & -0.05 \\
\hline & 1983. & 19.90 & 19.84 & -0.05 & -0.26 \\
\hline & 1984 & . 17.36 & 17.24 & -0.11 & -0.66 \\
\hline & 1985 & 16.59 & 16.43 & -0.16 & -0.94 \\
\hline & 1986 & 17.66 & 17.49 & -0.17 & -0.97 \\
\hline & 1987 & 17.66 & 17.46 & -0.19 & -1.09 \\
\hline & 1988 & 18.02 & 17.82 & -0.20 & -1.13 \\
\hline & 1989 & 17.87 & 17.66 & -0.21 & -1.19 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LPET} & 1981 & 2.63 & 2.77 & 0.14 & 5.17 \\
\hline & 1982 & 2.45 & 2.50 & 0.04 & 1.53 \\
\hline & 1983 & 2.99 & 3.01 & 0.01 & 0.49 \\
\hline & 1984 & 3:36 & 3.38 & 0.00 & 0.04 \\
\hline & 1985 & 2.89 & 2.88 & -0.02 & -0.52 \\
\hline & 1986 & 2.53 & 2.51 & -0.02 & -0.96 \\
\hline & 1987 & 2.71 & 2.67 & -0.04 & \(-1.51\) \\
\hline & 1988 & 2.84 & 2.80 & -0.04 & -1.30 \\
\hline & 1989. & 2.89 & 2.86 & -0.04 & -1.36 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LBSM} & 1981 & 6.55 & 6.72 & 0.18 & 2.71 \\
\hline & 1982 & 6.56 & 6.70 & 0.15 & 2.23 \\
\hline & 1983 & 7.33 & 7.44 & 0.11 & 1.57 \\
\hline & 1984 & 7.99 & 8.07 & 0.08 & 0.98 \\
\hline & 1985 & 8.28 & 8.34 & 0.06 & 0.75 \\
\hline & 1986 & 8.05 & 8.10 & 0.05 & 0.68 \\
\hline & 1987 & 8.36 & 8.38 & 0.03 & 0.33 \\
\hline & 1988 & 8.51 & 8.54 & 0.03 & 0.32 \\
\hline & 1989 & 8.49 & 8.52 & 0.03 & 0.30 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Exchange Rate (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & \begin{tabular}{l}
Base \\
Run
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Shock \\
Run
\end{tabular} & Difference & Percentage Differencé \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LMACH} & 1981 & 27.37 & 26.68 & -0.69 & -2.52 \\
\hline & 1982 & 29.73 & 28.77 & -0.97 & -3.25 \\
\hline & 1983 & 25.61 & 24.43 & -1.18 & -4.60 \\
\hline & 1984 & 32.91 & 31.44 & -1.47 & -4.46 \\
\hline & 1985 & 28.71 & 27.03 & -1.68 & -5.87 \\
\hline & 1986 & 30.29 & 28.51 & -1.78 & -5.88 \\
\hline & 1987 & 29.19 & 27.35 & -1.84 & -6.32 \\
\hline & 1988 & 33.05 & 31.11 & -1.95 & -5.89 \\
\hline & 1989 & 32.05 & 30.02 & -2.03 & -6.32 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LELEC} & 1981 & 6.41 & 6.34 & -0.06 & 0.98 \\
\hline & 1982 & 6.51 & 6.47 & -0.04 & -0.58 \\
\hline & 1983 & 6.95 & 6.95 & -0.01 & . 0.09 \\
\hline & 1984 & 7.02 & 6.99 & -0.04 & - 0.55 \\
\hline & 1985 & 7.55 & 7.53 & -0.02 & 0.20 \\
\hline & 1986 & 9.39 & 9.41 & -0.03 & 0.27 \\
\hline & 1887 & 11.49 & 11.53 & 0.04 & 0.32 \\
\hline & 1988 & 13.78 & 13.82 & \(\bigcirc 0.04\) & 0.29 \\
\hline & 1989 & 14.07 & 14:11 & 0.05 & 0.32 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LOTH} & 1981 & 30.80 & 29.20 & \(-1.60\) & -5.19 \\
\hline & 1982 & 31.67 & . 30.25 & -1.43 & -4.50 \\
\hline & 1983 & 27.21 & 26.21 & -0.99 & -3.66 \\
\hline & 1984 & 26.99 & 26.34 & -0.66 & -2.43 \\
\hline & 1985 & 28.54 & 28.02 & -0.51 & -1.80 \\
\hline & 1986 & 34.50 & 34.12 & -0.38 & -1.10 \\
\hline & 1987 & 36.79 & . 36.58 & -0.21 & -0.56 \\
\hline & 1988 & 36.60 & 36.45 & -0.14 & -0.40 \\
\hline & 1989 & 36.71 & 36.58 & -0.13 & .-0.36 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Exchange Rate (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & \begin{tabular}{l}
Shock \\
Fun
\end{tabular} & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PFOOD} & 1981 & 273 & 286 & 13.82 & 5.07 \\
\hline & 1982 & 297 & 316 & 18.95 & 6.37 \\
\hline & 1983 & 368 & 395 & 27.25 & 7.39 \\
\hline & 1984. & 527 & 570 & 43.11 & 8.17 \\
\hline & 1985 & 663 & 719 & 55.87 & 8.42 \\
\hline & 1986 & 698 & 759 & 60.32 & 8.63 \\
\hline & 1987 & 738 & 801 & 63.69 & 8.63 \\
\hline & 1988 & 798 & 866 & 68.05 & 8.52 \\
\hline & 1989 & 847 & 918 & 71.30 & 8.42 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PBEV} & 1981 & 364 & 371 & 7.14 & 1.96 \\
\hline & 1982 & 394 & 407 & 13.14 & 3.33 \\
\hline & 1983 & 445 & 465 & 20.23 & 4.54 \\
\hline & 1984 & 551 & 583 & 31.75 & 5.76 \\
\hline & 1985 & 671 & 714 & 43.74 & 6.52 \\
\hline & 1986 & . 745 & 797 & 51.65 & 6.93 \\
\hline & 1987 & 800 & 857 & 57.08 & 7.13 \\
\hline & 1988 & 858 & 919 & 61.88 & 7.21 \\
\hline & 1989 . & 909 & 975 & 65.82 & 7.23 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PTOB} & 1981 & 269 & 277 & 8.65 & 3.21 \\
\hline & 1982 & 301 & 316 & 15.83 & 5.26 \\
\hline & 1983 & 360 & 384 & 24.33 & 6.75 \\
\hline & 1984 & 487 & 525 & 38.16 & 7.84 \\
\hline & 1985 & 630 & 682 & 52.50 & 8.33 \\
\hline & 1986 & 718 & 780 & 61.88 & 8.62 \\
\hline & 1987 & 783 & 851 & 68.28 & 8.72 \\
\hline & 1988 & 851 & 925 & 73.96 & 8.69 \\
\hline & 1989 & 912 & 991 & 78.61 & 8.61 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PTEX} & 1981 & 427 & 439 & 12.76 & 2.99 \\
\hline & 1982 & 465 & 487 & 22.14 & 4.76 \\
\hline & 1983 & 544 & 577 & 33.23 & 6.10 \\
\hline & 1984 & 720 & 772 & 51.91 & 7.21 \\
\hline & 1985 & 909 & 980 & 70.50 & 7.75 \\
\hline & 1986 & 101 & 109 & 81.38 & . 8.05 \\
\hline & 1987 & 116 & 117 & 88.43 & 8.15 \\
\hline & 1988 & 117 & 126 & 95.04 & 8.14 \\
\hline & 1989 & 124 & 134 & 100 & 8.07 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Exchange Rate (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base
Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PWOOD} & . 1981 & 367 & 378 & 10.32 & 2.81 \\
\hline & 1982 & 395 & 412 & 17.07 & 4.32 \\
\hline & 1983 & 455 & 481 & 25.17 & 5.52 \\
\hline & 1984 & 591 & 631 & 39.31 & 6.64 \\
\hline & 1985 & 731 & 784 & 52.83 & 7.22 \\
\hline & 1986 & 797 & 857 & 59.97 & 7.52 \\
\hline & 1987. & 845 & 910 & 64.49 & 7.63 \\
\hline & 1988 & 904 & 973 & 69.04 & 7.63 \\
\hline & 1989 & 957 & 103 & 72.75 & 7.60 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PPAP} & 1981 & 303 & 318 & 14.23 & 4.68 \\
\hline & 1982 & 329 & 348 & 19.52 & 5.93 \\
\hline & 1983 & . 402 & 430 & 28.06 & 6.98 \\
\hline & 1984 & 565 & 610 & 44.39 & 7.84 \\
\hline & 1985 & . 705 & 763 & 57.53 & 8.15 \\
\hline & 1986 & 742 & 804 & 62.12 & 8.38 \\
\hline & 1987 & 782 & 848 & 65.57 & 8.38 \\
\hline & 1988 & 845 & 915 & 70.08 & 8.29 \\
\hline & 1989 & 895 & 968 & 73.43 & 8.20 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PCHEM} & 1981 & 285 & 299 & 13.47 & 4.71 \\
\hline & 1982 & 309 & 328 & 18.47 & 5.96 \\
\hline & 1983 & 378 & 405 & 26.55 & 7.01 \\
\hline & 1984 & 533 & 576 & 42.01 & 7.87 \\
\hline & 1985 & 666 & 720 & 54.44 & 8.17 \\
\hline & 1986 & 700 & 759 & 58.79 & 8.39 \\
\hline & 1987 & 739 & 801 & 62.04 & 8.39 \\
\hline & 1988 & 798 & 864 & 66.32 & 8.31 \\
\hline & 1989 & 845 & 914 & 69.49 & 8.22 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PPET} & & 758 & 764 & & \\
\hline & 1982 & 814 & 825 & 10.90 & 1.34 \\
\hline & 1983 & 882 & 900 & 18.17 & 2.06 \\
\hline & 1984 & 991. & 102 & 29.43 & 2.97 \\
\hline & 1985 & 112 & 116 & 42.42 & 3.78 \\
\hline & 1886 & 123 & 128 & 53.57 & 4.35 \\
\hline & 1987 & 132 & 139 & 62.95 & 4.75 \\
\hline & 1988 & 141 & 149 & 71.43 & 5.05 \\
\hline & 1989 & 150 & 158 & 78.84 & 5.25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Exchange Rate (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PBSM} & 1981 & 245 & 254 & 8.09. & 3.29 \\
\hline & 1982 & 270 & 284 & 14.20 & 5.25 \\
\hline & 1983 & 321 & 342 & 21.40 & 6.66 \\
\hline & 1984 & 433 & 467 & 33.45 & 7.71 \\
\hline & 1985 & 556 & 602 & 45.54 & 8.18 \\
\hline & 1986 & 624 & 677 & 52.79 & 8.45 \\
\hline & 1987 & 673 & 731 & 57.54 & 8.54 \\
\hline & 1988 & 728 & 790 & 61.92 & 8.50 \\
\hline & 1889 & 777 & 842 & 65.51 & 8.43 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PMACH} & 1981 & 184 & 193 & 9.36 & 5.08 \\
\hline & 1982 & 231 & 246 & 14.92 & 6.43 \\
\hline & 1983 & 290 & 312 & 21.79 & 7.49 \\
\hline & 1984 & 411 & 445 & 34.07 & 8.28 \\
\hline & 1985 & 530 & 575 & 45.44 & 8.57 \\
\hline & 1886 & 581 & 632 & 51.01 & 8.78 \\
\hline & 1987 & 619 & 673 & 54.52 & 8.81 \\
\hline & 1988 & 668 & 727 & 58.28 & 8.71 \\
\hline & 1889 & 712 & 773 & 61.32 & 8.61 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PELEC} & 1981 & 198 & 205 & - 7.10 & 3.58 \\
\hline & 1982 & 210 & 220 & - 9.74 & 4.62 \\
\hline & 1983 & 247 & 261 & 13.99 & 5.66 \\
\hline & 1984 & . 329 & 351 & 22.15 & 6.73 \\
\hline & 1985 & 398 & 427 & 28.71 & 7.20 \\
\hline & 1986 & 417 & 448 & 30.99 & 7.43 \\
\hline & 1987 & 437 & 470 & 32.71 & 7.48 \\
\hline & 1988 & 468 & 503 & 34.97 & 7.46 \\
\hline & 1989 & 493 & 529 & 36.64 & 7.43 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{POTH} & 1981 & 364 & 378 & 14.02 & 3.85 \\
\hline & 1982 & 402 & 425 & 23.46 & 5.84 \\
\hline & 1983 & 485 & 520 & 34.73 & 7.15 \\
\hline & 1984 & 672 & 726 & 54.23 & 8.07 \\
\hline & 1985 & 866 & 939 & 73.06 & 8.43 \\
\hline & 1986 & 961 & 104 & 83.27 & 8.67 \\
\hline & 1987 & 103 & 111 & 89.75 & 8.72 \\
\hline & 1988 & 111 & 121 & 96.16 & 8.65 \\
\hline & 1989 & 119 & 129. & 101.40 & 8.55 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.3 Effect of a Ten Percent Increase in Exchange Rate (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Base } \\
& \text { Fan }
\end{aligned}
\] & Shock fun & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QRNES} & 1981 & 112 & 111 & -149.99 & -1.33 \\
\hline & 1982 & 117 & 114 & -280.70 & -2.40 \\
\hline & 1983 & 121 & 117 & -348.62 & -2.89 \\
\hline & 1984 & 120 & 115 & -399.46 & -3.34 \\
\hline & 1985 & 115 & 110 & -436.13 & -3.78 \\
\hline & 1986 & 122 & 117 & -460.85 & -3.78 \\
\hline & 1987 & 130 & 125 & -475.08 & -3.66 \\
\hline & 1988 & 138 & 133 & -491.02 & -3.55 \\
\hline & 1989 & 148 & 143 & -507.96 & -3.43 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LRNES} & 1981 & 526 & 520 & -5.64 & -1.07 \\
\hline & 1982 & 531 & 521 & -10.01 & -1.88 \\
\hline & 1983 & 527 & 515 & -11.20 & -2.13 \\
\hline & 1984 & 515 & 502 & -12.66 & -2.46 \\
\hline & 1985 & . 477 & 462 & -15.38 & -3.22 \\
\hline & 1986 & 495 & 480 & -15.44 & -3.11 \\
\hline & 1987 & 518 & 504 & -14.21 & -2.74 \\
\hline & 1988 & 545 & 531 & -13.95 & -2.56 \\
\hline & 1989 & 554 & 540 & -14.04 & -2.53 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4 Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports on Employment, Output and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QFOOD} & 1981 & 5143 & 5150 & 6.77 & 0.13 \\
\hline & 1982 & 5322 & 5339 & 17.48 & 0.33 \\
\hline & 1983 & 5246 & 5277 & 31.11 & 0.59 \\
\hline & 1984 & 5615 & 5658 & 43.70 & 0.78 \\
\hline & 1985 & 5463 & 5519 & 56.71 & 1.04 \\
\hline & 1986 & 5680 & 5750 & 70.77 & 1.25 \\
\hline & 1987 & 5993 & 6080 & 87.45 & 1.46 \\
\hline & 1988 & . 6362 & 6467 & 105.11 & 1.66 \\
\hline & 1989 & 6785 & 6905 & 120.33 & 1.77 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QBEV} & 1981 & 426 & 427 & 0.90 & 0.21 \\
\hline & 1982 & 460 & 462 & 2.17 & 0.47 \\
\hline & 1983 & 476 & 479 & 3.64 & 0.76 \\
\hline & 1984 & 469. & 474 & 4.94 & 1.05 \\
\hline & 1985 & 466 & 472 & 6.37 & 1.37 \\
\hline & 1986 & 500 & 508 & 7.92 & 1.58 \\
\hline & 1987 & 549 & 559 & 9.67 & 1.76 \\
\hline & 1988 & 605 & 617 & 11.57 & 1.91 \\
\hline & 1989 & 667 & 680 & 13.23 & 1.98 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QTOB} & 1981 & 44.30 & 44.45 & 0.15 & 0.33 \\
\hline & 1982 & 44.18 & 44.55 & 0.37 & 0.83 \\
\hline & 1983 & 37.81 & 38.45 & 0.64 & 1.69 \\
\hline & 1984 & 28.99 & 29.89 & 0.89 & 3.06 \\
\hline & 1985 & 22.70 & 23:85 & 1.15 & 5.05 \\
\hline & 1986 & 23.78 & 25.21 & 1.42 & 5.99 \\
\hline & 1987 & 27.03 & 28.77 & 1.74 & 6.42 \\
\hline & 1988 & 30.99 & 33.05 & 2.05 & 6.62 \\
\hline & 1989 & 35.62 & 37.93 & 2.31 & 6.50 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QTEX} & 1981 & 800 & 801 & 0.43 & 0.00 \\
\hline & 1982 & 855 & 856 & 1.13 & 0.13 \\
\hline & 1983 & 876 & 878 & 2.20 & 0.25 \\
\hline & 1984 & 817 & 821 & 3.75 & 0.46 \\
\hline & 1985 & 751 & 757 & 6.15 & 0.82 . \\
\hline & 1986 & 760 & 769 & 8.39 & 1.10 \\
\hline & 1987 & 794 & 806 & 11.60 & 1.46 \\
\hline & 1988 & 822 & 837 & 15.25 & 1.85 \\
\hline & 1989 & 858 & 876 & 18.19 & 2.12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4 Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports on Employment, Output and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Base } \\
& \text { Run }
\end{aligned}
\] & 5hock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QWOOD} & 1981 & 651 & 653 & 1.72 & 0.26 \\
\hline & 1982 & 691 & 696 & 4.44 & 0.64 \\
\hline & 1983 & 665 & 673 & 8.12 & 1.22 \\
\hline & 1984 & 624 & 636 & 12.11 & 1.84 \\
\hline & 1985 & 496 & 513 & 16.90 & 3.41 \\
\hline & 1986 & 508 & 529 & 21.63 & 4.25 \\
\hline & 1987 & 557 & 585 & 27.73 & 4.97 \\
\hline & 1988 & 596. & 630 & 34.21 & 5.73 \\
\hline & 1989 & 651 & 691 & 39.37 & 6.04 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QPAP} & 1981 & 269 & 270 & 0.83 & 0.31 \\
\hline & 1982 & 280 & 282 & 1.74 & 0.62 \\
\hline & 1983 & 282 & 285 & 2.61 & 0.02 \\
\hline & 1984 & 269 & 272 & 3.24 & 1.20 \\
\hline & 1985 & 258 & 262 & 4.14 & 1.60 \\
\hline & 1986 & 280 & 285 & 4.97 & 1.77 \\
\hline & 1887 & 309 & 315 & 5.97 & 1.93 \\
\hline & 1988 & 336 & 343 & 7.00 & 2.08 \\
\hline & 1989 & 367 & 375 & 7.76 & 2.11 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QCHEM} & 1981 & 574 & 575 & 0.29 & 0.05 \\
\hline & 1982 & 549 & 549 & 0.70 & 0.13 \\
\hline & 1983 & 793 & 795 & 1.29 & 0.16 \\
\hline & 1984 & 559 & 561 & 1.97 & 0.35 \\
\hline & 1985 & 491 & 494 & 2.87 & 0.59 \\
\hline & 1986 & 593 & 597 & 3.65 & 0.62 \\
\hline & 1987. & 584 & 588 & 4.80 & 0.82 \\
\hline & 1988 & 610 & 616 & 5.99 & 0.98 \\
\hline & 1989 & 603 & 610 & 6.83 & 1.13 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QPET} & 1981 & 1366 & 1368 & 1.29 & 0.09 \\
\hline & 1982 & 1373 & 1376 & 3.47 & 0.25 \\
\hline & 1983 & 1405 & 1411 & 6.24 & 0.44 \\
\hline & 1984 & 1320 & 1329 & 8.95 & 0.68 \\
\hline & 1885 & 1242 & 1253 & 11.76 & 0.95 \\
\hline & 1986 & 1253 & 1267 & 14.78 & 1.18 \\
\hline & 1987 & 1301 & 1319 & 18.23 & 1.40 \\
\hline & 1988 & 1373 & 1395 & 21.98 & 1.60 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1464 & 1489 & 25.42 & 1.74 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4 Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports on Employment, Output and Prices of fural Nonfarm Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base fun & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QMACH} & 1981 & 444 & 446 & 1.21 & 0.27 \\
\hline & 1982 & 424 & 427 & 2.84 & 0.67 \\
\hline & 1983 & 386 & 391 & 5.03 & 1.30 \\
\hline & 1984 & 268 & 275 & 7.29 & 2.71 \\
\hline & 1985 & 194 & 204 & 10.14 & 5.22 \\
\hline & 1986 & 222 & 235 & 12.80 & 5.74 \\
\hline & 1987 & 253 & 270 & 16.57 & 6.53 \\
\hline & 1988 & 276 & 296 & 20.47 & 7.41 \\
\hline & 1989 & 316 & 340 & 23.42 & 7.39 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QELEC} & 1981 & 184 & 184 & 0.59 & 0.32 \\
\hline & 1982 & 228 & 229 & 1.33 & 0.58 \\
\hline & 1983 & 339 & 341 & 2.51 & 0.74 \\
\hline & 1984 & 345. & 350 & 4.32 & 1.25 \\
\hline & 1985 & 458 & 465 & 7.25 & 1.58 \\
\hline & 1986 & 583 & 592 & 9.38 & 1.61 \\
\hline & 1987 & 658 & 671 & 13.20 & 2.01 \\
\hline & 1888 & 707 & 724 & 17.20 & 2.43 \\
\hline & 1989 & 770 & 790 & 19.77 & 2.57 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QOTH} & 1981 & 506 & 508 & 1.70 & 0.33 \\
\hline & 1982 & 516 & 520 & 3.56 & 0.69 \\
\hline & 1983 & 526 & 531 & 5.10 & 0.97 \\
\hline & 1984 & 519 & 525 & 6.05 & 1.16 \\
\hline & 1985 & 486 & 493 & 7.64 & 1.57 \\
\hline & 1986 & 512 & 521 & 9.19 & 1:79 \\
\hline & 1987 & 576 & 587 & 10.72 & 1.86 \\
\hline & 1988 & 645 & 658 & 12.48 & 1.83 \\
\hline & 1989 & 724 & 738. & 13.86 & 1.91 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LFOOD} & 1981 & 170 & 171 & 0.21 & 0.12 \\
\hline & 1982 & 178 & 178 & 0.54 & 0.30 \\
\hline & 1983 & 185 & 186 & 0.97 & 0.52 \\
\hline & 1984 & 174 & 176 & 1.36 & 0.78 \\
\hline & 1985 & 167 & 168 & 1.76 & 1.05 \\
\hline & 1986 & 175 & 178 & 2.20 & 1.25 \\
\hline & 1987 & 184 & 187 & 2.72 & 1.47 \\
\hline & 1988 & 203 & 206 & 3.27 & 1.61 \\
\hline & 1989 & 213 & 217 & 3.74 & 1.75 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4 Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports on Employwent, Output and Prices of Fural Nonfarm Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LBEV} & 1981 & 18.73 & 18.75 & 0.01 & 0.07 \\
\hline & 1982 & 18.84 & 18.85 & 0.01 & 0.05 \\
\hline & 1983 & 20.31 & 20.31 & -0.00 & -0.01 \\
\hline & 1984 & 22.25 & 22.24 & -0.01 & -0.03 \\
\hline & 1985 & 10.48 & 20.48 & -0.01 & -0.04 \\
\hline & 1986 & 19.44 & 19.43 & -0.01 & -0.07 \\
\hline & 1987 & 19.70 & 19.68 & -0.02 & -0.14 \\
\hline & 1988 & 20.09 & 20.06 & -0.03 & -0.13 \\
\hline & 4989. & 20.11 & 20.02 & -0.02 & 0.11 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LTOB} & 1981 & 2.48 & 2.48 & -0.00 & -0.05 \\
\hline & 1982 & 2.32 & 2.31 & -0.01 & -0.37 \\
\hline & 1983 & 2.66 & 2.65 & -0.02 & -0.66 \\
\hline & 1984 & 3.01 & 2.99 & -0.02 & -0.81 \\
\hline & 1985 & 2.57 & 2.54 & -0.03 & -1.17 \\
\hline & 1986 & 2.03 & 2.01 & -0.02 & -1.24 \\
\hline & 1987 & 2.23 & 2.20 & -0.03 & -1.50 \\
\hline & 1988 & 2.20 & 2.17 & -0.03 & -1.44 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1.95 & 1.93 & -0.02 & -1.18 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LTEX} & 1981 & 137 & 137 & 0.02 & 0.01 \\
\hline & 1982 & 136 & 136 & 0.02 & 0.01 \\
\hline & 1983 & 134 & 134 & 0.06 & 0.04 \\
\hline & 1984 & 125 & 125 & 0.15 & 0.12 \\
\hline & 1985 & 110 & 110 & 0.31 & 0.28 \\
\hline & 1986 & 102 & 103 & 0.49 & 0.47 \\
\hline & 1987 & 102 & 102 & 0.71 & 0.69 \\
\hline & 1988 & 99 & 100 & 1.03 & 1.04 \\
\hline & 1989 & 95 & 96 & 1.34 & 1.41 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LWOOD} & 1981 & 93.01 & 93.18 & 0.17 & 0.18 \\
\hline & 1982 & 88.89 & 89.23 & 0.34 & 0.38 \\
\hline & 1983 & 80.93 & 81.45 & 0.52 & 0.64 \\
\hline & 1984 & 82.83 & 83.52 & 0.69 & 0.83 \\
\hline & 1985 & 73.66 & 74.73 , & 1.07 & 1.45 \\
\hline & 1986 & 82.54 & 83.65 & 1.10 & 1.33 \\
\hline & 1987 & 91.84 & 92.90 & 1.06 & 1.16 \\
\hline & 1988 & 95.45 & 96.51 & 1.06 & 1.11 \\
\hline & 1989 & 98.93 & 99.70 & 0.78 & 0.79 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4 Effect of an Increase in Merchandise. Exports on Employment, Output and Prices of Rural Nonfam Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & \begin{tabular}{l}
Base \\
Run
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Shock \\
Run
\end{tabular} & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{L.PAP} & 1981 & 12.99 & 13.01 & 0.02 & 0.15 \\
\hline & 1982 & 13.06 & 13.10 & 0.04 & 0.28 \\
\hline & 1983 & 13.55 & 13.60 & 0.05 & 0.37 \\
\hline & 1984 & 11.17 & 11.23 & 0.06 & 0.56 \\
\hline & 1985 & 10.68 & 10.76 & 0.08 & 0.75 \\
\hline & 1986 & 10.88 & 10.97 & 0.10 & 0.88 \\
\hline & 1987 & 11.50 & 11.62 & 0.11 & 0.97 \\
\hline & 1988 & 12,09 & 12.22 & 0.13 & 0.10 \\
\hline & 1989 & 12.72 & 12.87 & 0.15 & 1.18 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LCHEM} & 1981 & 16.90 & 16.90 & 0.00 & 0.03 \\
\hline & 1982 & 16.53 & 16.54 & '0.01 & 0.05 \\
\hline & 1983 & 19.80 & 19.91 & 0.01 & 0.05 \\
\hline & 1984 & 17.36 & 17.38 & 0.01 & 0.10 \\
\hline & 1985 & 16.59 & 16.61 & 0.02 & 0.14 \\
\hline & 1986 & 17.66 & 17.69 & 0.03 & 0.18 \\
\hline & 1987 & 17.66 & 17.70 & 0.04 & 0.24 \\
\hline & 1988 & 18.02 & 18.07 & 0.06 & 0.31 \\
\hline & 1989 & 17.87 & 17.94 & 0.07 & 0.39 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LPET} & 1981 & 2.63 & 2.63 & 0.00 & 0.16 \\
\hline & 1982 & 2.47 & 2.47 & - 0.00 & 0.15 \\
\hline & 1983 & 2.99 & 2.99 & 0.00 & 0.06 \\
\hline & 1984 & 3.38 & 3.38 & 0.00 & 0.08 \\
\hline & 1985 & 2.89 & 2.90 & 0.00 & 0.15 \\
\hline & 1986 & 2.53 & 2.54 & 0.01 & 0.38 \\
\hline & 1987 & 2.71 & 2.72 & 0.01 & 0.31 \\
\hline & 1988 & 2.84 & 2.85 & 0.01 & 0.52 \\
\hline & 1989 & 2.89 & 2.91 & . 0.02 & 0.84 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LBSM} & 1981 & 6.55 & 6.55 & \[
0.00
\] & 0.03 \\
\hline & 1982 & 6.56 & 6.55 & -0.00 & -0.04 \\
\hline & 1983 & 7.33 & 7.31 & -0.01 & -0.15 \\
\hline & 1984 & 7.99 & 7.98 & -0.01 & -0.18 \\
\hline & 1985 & 8.28 & 8.25 & -0.02 & -0.28 \\
\hline & 1986 & 8.05 & 8.02 & --0.02 & -0.30 \\
\hline & 1987 & 8.36 & 8.32 & -0.03 & -0.41 \\
\hline & 1988 & 8.51 & 8.48 & -0.03 & -0.41 \\
\hline & 1989 & 8.49 & 8.46 & -0.03 & -0.35 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4 Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports on Employment, Output and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year. & Base Run & \begin{tabular}{l}
Shock \\
Fiun
\end{tabular} & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LMACH} & 1981 & 27.37 & 27.42 & 0.05. & 0.19 \\
\hline & 1982 & 29.73 & 29.85 & 0.11 & 0.38 \\
\hline & 1983 & 25.61 & 25.81 & 0.19 & 0.76 \\
\hline & 1984 & 32.91 & 33.19 & 0.28 & 0.84 \\
\hline & 1985 & 28.71 & 29.09 & 0.38 & 1.33 \\
\hline & 1986 & 30.29 & 30.77 & 0.48 & 1.58 \\
\hline & 1987 & 29.19 & 29.81 & 0.62 & 2.13 \\
\hline & 1988 & 33.05 & 33.82 & 0.76 & 2.31 \\
\hline & 1989 & 32.04 & 32.91 & 0.86 & 2.69 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LELEC} & 1981 & 6.41 & 6.41 & 0.00 & 0.06 \\
\hline & 1982 & 6.51 & 6.51 & 0.01 & 0.11 \\
\hline & 1983 & 6.95 & 6.96 & 0.01 & 0.10 \\
\hline & 1984 & 7.02 & 7.03 & 0.01 & 0.12 \\
\hline & 1985 & 7.55 & 7.56 & 0.01 . & 0.12 \\
\hline & 1986 & 9.39 & 9.39 & 0.01 & 0.07 \\
\hline & 1987 & 11.49 & 11.50 & 0.01 & 0.05 \\
\hline & 1988 & 13.78 & 13.79 & 0.00 & 0.03 \\
\hline & 1989 & 14.07 & 14.07 & 0.00 & 0.01 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LOTH} & 1981 & 30.80 & 30.86 & \(\therefore 0.06\) & 0.19 \\
\hline & 1982 & 31.67 & 31.76 & 0.09 & 0.26 \\
\hline & 1983 & 27.21 & 27.32 & 0.11 & 0.41 \\
\hline & 1984 & 26.99 & 27.10 & 0.11 & 0.39 \\
\hline & 1985 & 28.53 & 28.70 & 0.16 & 0.57 \\
\hline & 1986 & 34.50 & 34.64 & 0.14 & 0.40 \\
\hline & 1987 & 36.79 & 36.93 & 0.14 & 0.38 \\
\hline & 1988 & 36.60 & 36.73 & 0.14 & 0.38 \\
\hline & 1889 & 36.71 & 36.80 & 0.09 & 0.24 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{LRNES} & 1981 & 526 & 526 & 0.56 & 0.11 \\
\hline & 1982 & 531 & 532 & 1.16 & 0.22 \\
\hline & 1983 & 527 & 529 & 1.90 & 0.36 \\
\hline & 1984 & 515 & 517 & 2.63 & 0.51 \\
\hline & 1985 & 477 & 481 & 3.74 & 0.78 \\
\hline & 1986 & 495 & 500 & 4.49 & 0.91 \\
\hline & 1987 & 518 & 523 & 5.32 & 1.03 \\
\hline & 1988 & 545 & 551 & 6.38 & 1.17 \\
\hline & 1989 & 554 & 561 & 6.99 & 1.26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4. Effect of an Increase in Merchandiae Exports on Employment, GVA and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QRNES} & 1981 & 11271.00 & 11287.00 & 15.88 & 0.14 \\
\hline & 1982 & 11688.00 & 11727.00 & 39.24 & 0.34 \\
\hline & 1983 & 12061.00 & 12129.00 & 68.50 & 0.57 \\
\hline & 1984 & 11950.00 & 12047.00 & 97.23 & 0.81 \\
\hline & 1985 & 11529.00 & 11661.00 & 131.07 & 1.14 \\
\hline & 1986 & 12206.00 & 12371.00 & 164.90 & 1.35 \\
\hline & 1987 & 12983.00 & 13190.00 & 207.70 & 1.60 \\
\hline & 1988 & 13835.00 & 14089.00 & 253.32 & 1.83 \\
\hline & 1989 & 14804.00 & 15095.00 & 290.50 & 1.96 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PFOOD} & 1981 & 273.02 & 272.55 & -0.47 & \(-0.17\) \\
\hline & 1982 & 297.41 & 296.35 & -1.05 & -0.35 \\
\hline & 1983 & 368.45. & 366.46 & -1.99 & -0.54 \\
\hline & 1984 & 527.52 & 524.11 & -3.42 & -0.65 \\
\hline & 1985 & 663.18 & 657.44 & -5.73 & -0.86 \\
\hline & 1986 & 698.83 & 691.41 & -7.42 & -1.06 \\
\hline & 1987 & 738.15 & 727.71 & -10.45 & -1.42 \\
\hline & 1988 & 798.85 & 785.25 & -13.61 & -1.70 \\
\hline & 1989 & 847.12 & 831.47 & -15.64 & -1.85 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PBEV} & 1981 & 364.13 & 363.89 & -0.24 & -0.07 \\
\hline & 1982 & 394.49 & 393.83 & -0.66 & -0.17 \\
\hline & 1983 & 445.42 & 444.08 & -1.34 & -0.30 \\
\hline & 1984 & 551.46 & 549.07 & -2.39 & -0.43 \\
\hline & 1985 & 671.20 & 667.12 & -4.08 & -0.61 \\
\hline & 1986 & 745.67 & 739.93 & -5.75 & \(-0.77\) \\
\hline & 1987 & 800.85 & 792.76 & -8.09 & -1.01 \\
\hline & 1988 & 858.05 & 847.23 & -10.82 & -1.26 \\
\hline & 1989 & 909.76 & 896.61 & -13.15 & -1.45 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4. Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports on Employnent, GVA and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{QRNES} & 1981 & 11271.00 & 11287.00 & 15.88 & 0.14 \\
\hline & 1982 & 11688.00 & 11727.00 & 39.24 & 0.34 \\
\hline & 1983 & 12061.00 & 12129.00 & 68.50 & 0.57 \\
\hline & 1984 & 11950.00 & 12047.00 & 97.23 & 0.81 \\
\hline & 1985 & 11529.00 & 11661.00 & 131.07 & 1.14 \\
\hline & 1986 & 12206.00 & 12371.00 & 164.90 & 1.35 \\
\hline & 1987 & 12983.00 & 13190.00 & 207.70 & 1.60 \\
\hline & 1988 & 13835.00 & 14089.00 & 253.32 & 1.83 \\
\hline & 1989 & 14804.00 & 15095.00 & 290.50 & 1.96 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PFOOD} & 1981 & 273.02 & 272.55 & -0.47 & -0.17 \\
\hline & 1982 & 297.41 & 296.35 & -1.05 & -0.35 \\
\hline & 1983 & 368.45. & 366.46 & -1.99 & -0.54 \\
\hline & 1984 & 527.52 & 524.11 & -3.42 & -0.65 \\
\hline & 1985 & 663.18 & 657.44 & -5.73 & -0.86 \\
\hline & 1986 & 698.83 & 691.41 & -7.42 & -1.06 \\
\hline & 1987 & 738.15 & 727.71 & -10.45 & -1.42 \\
\hline & 1988 & 798.85 & 785.25 & -13.61 & \(-1.70\) \\
\hline & 1989 & 847.12 & 831.47 & -15.64 & -1.85 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PBEV} & 1981 & 364.13 & 363.89 & -0.24 & -0.07 \\
\hline & 1982 & 394.49 & 393.83 & -0.66 & -0.17 \\
\hline & 1983 & 445.42 & 444.08 & -1.34 & -0.30 \\
\hline & 1984 & 551.46 & 549.07 & -2.39 & -0.43 \\
\hline & 1985 & 671.20 & 667.12 & -4.08 & -0.61 \\
\hline & 1986 & 745.67 & 739.93 & -5.75 & -0.77 \\
\hline & 1987 & 800.85 & 792.76 & -8.09 & -1.01 \\
\hline & 1988 & 858.05 & 847.23 & -10.82 & -1.26 \\
\hline & 1989 & 909.76 & 896.61 & -13.15 & -1.45 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PTOB} & 1981 & 269.16 & 268.87 & -0.29 & -0.11 \\
\hline & 1982 & 301.13 & 300.34 & -0.79 & -0.26 \\
\hline & 1983 & 360.29 & 358.68 & -1.61 & -0.45 \\
\hline & 1984 & 487.05 & 484.17 & -2.88 & -0.59 \\
\hline & 1985 & 630.19 & 625.28 & -4.91 & -0.78 \\
\hline & 1986 & 718.25 & 711.35 & -6.90 & -0.96 \\
\hline & 1987 & 783.32 & 773.61 & -9.71 & -1.24 \\
\hline & 1988 & 851.20 & 838.22 & -12.98 & -1.52 \\
\hline & 1989 & 912.59 & 896.84 & -15.75 & -1.73 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4. Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports on Employment, GVA and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Baze Run & Shook Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PTEX} & 1981 & 427.12 & 426.69 & -0.43 & -0.10 \({ }^{\circ}\) \\
\hline & 1982 . & 465.04 & 463.91 & -1.13 & -0.24 \\
\hline & 1983 & 544.46 & 542.21 & -2.25 & -0.41 \\
\hline & 1984. & 720.28 & 716.31 & -3.97 & -0.55 \\
\hline & 1985 & 909.58 & 902.84 & -6:74 & -0.74 \\
\hline & 1986 & 1011.00 & 1002.00 & -9.31 & -0.92 \\
\hline & 1987 & 1085.00 & 1072.00 & -13.04 & -1.20 \\
\hline & 1988 & 1168.00 & 1150.00 & -17.31 & -1.48 \\
\hline & 1989 & 1242.00 & 1222.00 & -20.75 & -1.67 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PWOOD} & 1981 & 367.98 & 367.63 & -0.35 & -0.10 \\
\hline & 1982 & 395.18 & 394.30 & -0.89 & -0.22 \\
\hline & 1883 & 455.94 & 454.20 & -1.74 & -0.38 \\
\hline & 1984 & 591.81 & 588.87 & -3.04 & -0.51 \\
\hline & 1985 & 731.62 & 726.48 & -5.14 & -0.70 \\
\hline & 1986 & 797.70 & 790.70 & -7.00 & -0.88 \\
\hline & 1987 & 845.72 & 835.94 & -9.78 & -1.16 \\
\hline & 1988 & 904.62 & 891.69 & -12.93 & -1.43 \\
\hline & 1988. & 957.29 & 941.96 & -15.33 & -1.60 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PPAP} & 1981 & 303.89 & 303.41 & -0.48 & -0.16 \\
\hline & 1982 & 329.01 & 327.92 & -1.08 & -0.33 \\
\hline & 1983 & 402.17 & 400.12 & -2.05 & -0.51 \\
\hline & 1984 & 565.98 & 562.46 & -3.52 & -0.62 \\
\hline & 1985 & 705.67 & 699.77 & \(-5.90\) & -0.84 \\
\hline & 1986 & 742.39 & 734.75 & -7.64 & -1.03 \\
\hline & 1987 & 782.89 & 772.13 & \(-10.76\) & -1.37 \\
\hline & 1988 & 845.39 & 831.38 & -14.01 & -1.66 \\
\hline & 1989 & 895.09 & 878.98 & -16.11 & -1.80 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PCHEM} & 1981 & 285.97 & 285.51 & -0.46 & -0.16 \\
\hline & 1982 & 309.74 & 308.71 & -1.03 & -0.33 \\
\hline & 1983 & 378.97 & 377.03 & -1.94 & -0.51 \\
\hline & 1984 & 533.99 & 530.66 & -3.33 & -0.62 \\
\hline & 1985 & 666.19 & 660.60 & -5.59 & -0.84 \\
\hline & 1986 & 700.94 & 693.70 & -7.23 & -1.03 \\
\hline & 1987 & 739.25 & 729.07 & -10.18 & -1. 38 \\
\hline & 1988 & 798.41 & 785.14 & -13.26 & -1.66 \\
\hline & 1989 & 845.44 & 830.19 & -15.24 & -1.80 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4. Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports on Employment, GVA and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Variable & Year & Base Run & Shock Run & Difference & Percentage Difference \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PPET} & 1981 & 758.85 & 758.67 & -0.18 & -0.02 \\
\hline & 1982 & 814.91 & 814.39 & -0.52 & -0.06 \\
\hline & 1983 & 882.45 & 881.32 & -1.13 & -0.13 \\
\hline & 1984 & 991.39 & 989.29 & -2.10 & -0.21 \\
\hline & 1985 & 1122.00 & 1118:00 & -3.69 & -0.33 \\
\hline & 1986 & 1230.00 & 1225.00 & -5.47 & -0.45 \\
\hline & 1987 & 1324.00 & 1316.00 & -7.91 & -0.60 \\
\hline & 1988 & 1415.00 & 1404.00 & -10 38 & -0.77. \\
\hline & 1989 & 1500.00 & 1486.00 & -13.80 & -0.92 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PBSM} & 1981 & 245.92 & 245.64 & -0.27 & -0.11 \\
\hline & 1982 & 270.37 & 269.64 & -0.72 & -0.27 \\
\hline & 1983 & 321.33 & 319.89 & -1.44 & -0.45 \\
\hline & 1984. & 433.99 & 431.44 & -2.55 & -0.59 \\
\hline & 1985 & 556.65 & 552:31 & -4.34 & -0.78 \\
\hline & 1986 & 624.63 & 618.62 & -6.01 & -0.96 \\
\hline & 1987 & 673.76 & 665.34 & -8.42 & -1.25 \\
\hline & 1988 & 728.15 & 716.95 & -11.20 & -1.54 \\
\hline & 1989 & 777.29 & 763.83 & -13.46 & -1.73 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PMACH} & 1981 & 184.08 & 183.77 & -0.32 & -0.17 \\
\hline & 1982 & 231.92 & 231.14 & -0.78 & -0.34 \\
\hline & 1983 & 290.73 & 289.21 & -1.52 & -0.52 \\
\hline & 1984 & 411.59 & 408.93 & -2.65 & -0.64 \\
\hline & 1985 & 530.48 & 526.00 & -4.48 & -0.84 \\
\hline & 1986 & 581.23 & 575.20 & -6.03 & -1.04 \\
\hline & 1987 & 619.20 & 610.78 & -8.42 & -1.36 \\
\hline & 1988 & 668.80 & 657.70 & -11.10 & -1.66 \\
\hline & 1989 & 712.57 & 689.50 & -13.08 & -1.83 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{PELEC.} & 1981 & 198.35 & 198.11 & -0.24 & -0.12 \\
\hline & 1982 & 210.88 & 210.34 & -0.54 & -0.26 \\
\hline & 1983 & 247.38 & 246.36 & -1.02 & -0.41 \\
\hline & 1984 & 329.12 & 327.36 & -1.75 & -0.53 \\
\hline & 1985 & 398.81 & 395.87 & -2.95 & -0.74 \\
\hline & 1986 & 417.14 & 413.32 & -3.81 & -0.91 \\
\hline & 1987 & 437.34 & 431.97 & -5.37 & -1.23 \\
\hline & 1988 & 468.53 & 461.54 & -6.99 & -1.49 \\
\hline & 1989 & 493.32 & 485.29 & -8.04 & -1.63 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7.4. Effect of an Increase in Merchandise Exports on Employment, GVA and Prices of Rural Nonfarm Enterprises (continued).
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Variable & Year & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Base \\
Run
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Shock \\
Run
\end{tabular} & Difference & \\
Percentage \\
Difference
\end{tabular}

\section*{CHAPTER 8}

\section*{SUMMARY.}

Part of a project on Dynamice of Rural Development which is being implemented by the Philippine Institute for Development Studies, this study is generally aimed at analyzing the effects of macroeconomic policies on rural nonfarm enterprises (RNEs) by constructing a RNE submodel and linking it with the PIDS NEDA macroeconometric model for the Philippine Economy. The submodel consists of a series of seemingly unrelated equations describing the relationehipe of demand, tmployment, and peices with varioue explanatory variables. Equations were specified for each of the 12 sectors comprising RNEs which were defined as manufacturing enterprisea located outaide Metro Manila. The 12 sectors are: (1) food manufacturing; (2) beverage manufacturing; (3) tobacco manufacturing; (4) textile; wearing apparel and leather industries; (5) manufacture of wood and wood producte including furniture and fixtures; (6) manufacture of paper and paper products, printing and publiehing; (7) manufacture of chemicale and chemical, rubber and plastic producte; (8) manufacture of petroleum and coal producte; (9) basic metal industries; (10) manufacture of fabricated metal products, machineries (except electrical) and transport equipment; (11) manufacture of electrical machinery, apparatus, appliances and supplies; and (12) other manufacturing industries.

Demand for output of each RNE is characterized as a function of its price and indicators of aggregate domestic and international demand. Thus, the demand for the products of each RNE sector is aseumed to be a function of ite price, consumption expenditures, population and exports. It is hypothesized that the demand is negatively related with price and positively related with the latter three variables.

Assuming a specific production technology. traditional neoclassical theory of demand for labor hypothesizes it as positively related to the demand for output or: production, negatively to its own price, i.e. to wage rate, and positively to prices of subetitute inputs. \(\therefore\) In . the formulation of the model the number of workere in each sector was specifled as a function of output, wage, and interest rate. The interest rate was proxied by the interest rate of Treasury Bille or by the capital investment expenditures of RNEs.

Sector prices are modelled directly as a function of wholesale price index. These equations provide the linkage to the prices in the other sectors of the economy. Ueing a pricing rule characterized by stable markupe over variable costs, the PIDS NEDA model asuumed the wholeeale price index to be determined by the price of labor and imported inputs and the capacity utilization rates of firme. Increaees in demand are proxied by the ratio of total liquidity to potential GNP which in turn ie a function of capltal stock and labor force. The presence of a capital. stook index provides the link from increased investment expendituree to increased production.

Data on output, employment, and capital investment expenditures of RNEe were obtained from the NSO Ceneus or Annual Survey of Mainixactuming Esthibliehments. Dased on available literature the etructure of a few eileoted nonfarm industriee was discussed to provide some background on the induetry. Policies related to nonfarm enterpriees were also presented. These include fiecal, financial, trade, labor, investment incentivee, regional diepersal, and other policies.

The trend analysie for RNEs focueed on the number of establishments, output, employment, and prices for the period 1975 to 1989. The total number of all manufacturing establiehments in the country grew from 77,291 in 1975 to 85,310 in 1980 but went down to 77,805 in 1989. Most of these establishmente have lese than ten workere. These small industries comprised 92 percent of all establishments in 1975 and 87 percent in 1989. Geographically, about one-fifth of the establiehmente are located in Metro Manila and four-fifthe in the regions outaide the Metropolis. Over the period under study, the dietribution of establiehmente between Metro Manila and rural areas did not vary very much and changed only from 79.4 percent in the rural areas in 1976 to 81.8 percent in 1978 and 1979. In 1988. and 1989 , 80 percent of the establishmente were located in the rural areas.

A large proportion of the establishments in the food, beveriages, textile, wood, machinery and other induetriee ie located in the rurai areas. About 89 to 92 percent of the food manufacturing establishments are in the rural sireae. The corresponding proportions for other industries are: 96 to 98 percent for beverages; 71 to 79 percent for textile; 73 to 94 percent for wood; 68 to 76 percent for machineriee; and 83 to 86 percent for others.

Focusing on the RNEs, 47 percent of the eetabliehmente were engaged in food manufacturing in 1989. The second largest concentration was in the textile industry which
accounted for 20.8 percent of all RNEs. This was followed by machineries with 10.73 percent and wood with 10.02 percent. The rest are in others, paper; beverages, chemicale, basic metale, electrical, tobacco, and petroleum industries in that order.

By eize, the following are dominated by emall firme (i.e. those with lese than 10 workers): food, beverages, textile, wood, paper, chemicals, machinerieb, and othere. In contraet, tobacco, petroleum and electrical firme are composed mainly of large industries.

Considering the period from 1975 to 1989, about 45. to 58 percent of the total manufacturing output came from rural enterprise3 Añd"- 42 to 55 percent from Metwo Manila. The tobacco, textile, paper, chemicale, machinery, and other electrical industries produced higher quantities of output in Metro Manila. The rural areae contributed more to total output in the food, wood, petroleum and other manufacturing induetries. The beverages and the basic metal induetries exhibited an increasing concentration of output in the rural areae. Total GVA from RNEe increased from \(p 8.5\) billion in 1'975 to pl4.4 billion in 1989 representing an annual growth rate of 3.55 percent.

The manufacturing induetries employed more than 1.2 million people in 1989 about 50 percent of . whom were in rural enterprises and the other half in Metro Manila. The trend in the percentage distribution of employment followed almoet a similar pattern as that of total output. While the total number of workers was almost equally divided between the rural areas and Metro Manila especially from 1977 to 1981, RNEe seemed to absorb more employment: in the 1980e.

By industry, the food, beverages, wood, and petroleum induetriee in the rural areas employed more workere than those located in Metro Manila. On the other hand, more people were employed in the tobacco, paper, chemical and electrical industries in Metro Manila than in the eame typee of enterprises in the rural areas.

RNEs employed 391.27 thousand people in 1975. Between that year and 1989, the general trend in labor absorption by RNEs is increaeing at an annual rate of 2.92 percent. For the more recent period 1984 to 1989 , total employment by RNEe grew at a higher rate of 5.13 percent per annum. The food industry employed the greatest number of persons among all RNEs. This was followed by the textile, wood, machinery, and other industries.

Regardless of induetry group; pricee are on the dptrend. Prices steadily increased during the period but the rate of increase seemed to have accelerated after the 1983 criels.

In general, the resulte of the estimated demend equations for the 12 RNE sectore conform with a priori expectations. As hypothesized, price coefficiente are negative while those of coneumption expenditures are positive. The price coefficients were . statiatically significant in the following RNEs: textile, wood, paper, chemicals, petroleum, machineries, electrical, and othere. The demand elasticity of food with respect to ite own price is quite low, only -0.016 , that ie, a ten percent increase in the food price index would reeult in only 0.16 of one percent drop in value added from rural food induetrits. Like food, demand for beverages wae not eignificantly influenced by price although the price coefficient was negative. For food, beverages and tobacco coneumption expenditures yielded a positive and etatiatically significant coefficient.

The demand for textile, wood, paper, and machineriee was significantly influenced by prices and population. The demand for textile products is inelastic with a price elasticity of -0.686 while that for wood and machineries had almost a unitary elasticity.

Coefficiente of aggregate coneumption expenditures were generally positive and eignificant: The results for exporte were mixed in that bome equatione have positive coefficiente as hypothesized bút a few were nonelgnificant. Population was a eignificant factor in the demand equations for textile, basic. metals, electrical products, and other manufactures.

The estimates of the employment equations show that the coefficiente of output were poeltive and generally significant in food, wood, peiper, chemical; petroleum, machinery, electrical and other manufacturing industriee. The daily wage rate was expreseed either as an index with 1985 as the base or deflated by the implicit. price index for GNP. The coefficients of thie variable were negative thus conforming with theoretical expectation. For other inputs, capital investment was used in the employment equatione for food, beveragee, textile, wood, machineriee and electrical induetries. Ratee for 91-day Treasury Bille which were expressed either in nominal or real terms were used as proxy for intereet on capital in the employment equations for tobacco, paper, chemicals, petroleum, and basic metale RNEe. Precioue year's employment appeared as a significant variable for some industries.

In all price, equations, the wholesale price index had highly significant coefficients. Likewise, where the lagged dependent variable was added as an explanatory variable, the coefficients were positive and highly significant. Except for the petroleum price equation, all functions had \(a \quad R\) greater than 0.99. Nevertheless, the lagged dependent. variable explained \(88 \mathrm{p}^{-}\) petroleum prices.

The percentage changee in the eectoral prices reeulting from a one percent change in WPI are close to unity ( 0.90 or higher) for food, paper, and chemical induetriee; around 0.5 for tobacco, textile, wood and basic metale. The elaeticity of petroleum price is quite low, 0.15 understandably so boceuse petroleum pricer tare controlted by the agvernment.

To determine the tracking ability of the model a fully dynamic simulation was undertaken for the period 1981 to 1989. To validate the model, the root mean squate percentage errors (RMSPE) were computed for each endogenoue variable. The RMSPE measures the deviation of the eimulated variable from ite actual time path expreesed in percentage terms. Except for the grose value added from tobacco manufacture, the RMSPE etatistice ie lees than 25 percent. It is noteworthy that the GVA for food, textile, petroleum and othere has a RMSPE of leee than ten percent and the aggregate GVA for all RNEs has a RMSPE of only 5.B7.

For employment, only tobacco and petroleum industries have a relatively high RMSPE statistice but thoee for all other induatries are leas than 20 percent. The aggregate employment equation (identity) performed quite well with a RMSPE of lese than 10 percen+

The performance of the price equations appears to be much better than the output and employment equatione. Except for petroleum, all RMSPE statistice are lees than 10 peroent. Moreover, five out of the 12 eectore have RMSPE of less than 5 percent. The overall price index has a RMSPE of 5.96 percent.

By linking the RNE eubmodel with the PIDS NEDA macroeconometric madel, baseline solutions for the endogenoue. variables were computed. Shock run values were then computed and compared with the baseline solutions for three major policies (1) a ten percent increaee in"the wage. rate; (2) a ten percent increase in the exchange rate; and (3) an increase in merchandiee exports equivalent to one percent of Grose Domestic Product at the baseline.

In general, an increabe in the wage rate reeults in a decilne in employment, an increaee in pricee and consequently a drop in output. For all RNEs, a ten percent increase in wage rate is estimated to reeult in a drop in employment by about 1.8 percent initially. Continuing wage increase would reduce employment by up to 7 percent. Aggregate value added from RNEs would then decline by 1.1 to 4.2 percent.

The immediate effect of an increase in the exenange rate of the peso is to increase domeetic prices of imported goods ae well as locally produced goods.. Thus inflationary trends would ensue. The increase in prices would tend to lower the demand for goode whick would then reduce
 exercise determining the effecte of a ten percent devaluation on' RNEs generally conform with these expectatione. The only deviation observed is employment in the beverage and besic metals eectors which increased by a very emall percentage of 0.46 percent and 0.56 percent respectively for the period 1984 to 1989. Food prices increased by 7.75 percent which changes food output in the opposite direction by about two percent. Employment would also decline by about the sane percentage.

Continuing devauation has almost eimilar effecte on value added, employment and prices in the textile and wood induetries in terms of direction of change and the rate at which the percentage difference between the baseline and the shook run quantitiee change. For the rural paper induatry, the etability of the model ie reflected by an almost equal magnitude of change in output particularly between 1985 and 1989. : Likewise, employment changed by practically the same value annually.

The largest impact of the devaluation on value added ie observed in the rural machinery and electrical eectors where the percentage difference between the baseline solution and that of the shock run averaged 20.44 percent and 12.91 percent respectively, for the period 1985. to 1989. For employment, the largest effect occurred in the textile industry, with 7.0 percent, and machinery with 6.05 percent.

On the aggregate, the ten percent in the increase. In the exchange rate reduced employment by an average of 3.64 percent over the period 1985 to 1989 . and by 2.83 percent in value added over the same period.

An Increase in exports would result in a more favorable balance of payments position, which subeequently would increase the amount of foreign exchange available to finance imports which are an important input in the production of RNEs. Greater capacity to import would enhance investments and improve GDP growth. These changee would be expected to poeitively affect. employment and output in the RNEe. Empirical results of the simulation show that indeed such changes would occur due to an increase in merchandise exports. However, the magnitude of the difference between the baseline and the ehoek run appears relatively smaller than the previous two policies considered above. Constantino and Yap indicate that the macro model doee not distinguish between manufactured and unmanufactured exports.

As a when, the inttial effect of the incurse in merchandiee exporte on value added is only 0.14 percent which increased to almost 2.0 percent in 1989. The change in employment is emailer and ranged from 0.11 percent in the first year of the eimulation period to 1.26 percent in 1989.
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\section*{APPENDIX \\ Data Serie＇s Used in the RNE Submodel．}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline obs & QFOOD & QEEV & GT08 & QTEX & OWCJOD & OF－AF＇ \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline 1975 & 4014.070 － & \＄46．4900 & 61.35000 & 405.7400 & 401．6800 & 105.8000 \\
\hline 1976 & 4437．440 & 236.9900 & 38.96000 & 488.2200 & 436.0200 & 256．8400 \\
\hline 1977 & 3922.960 & 239．6400 & 38．66000 & 697.2700 & 518．1600 & 205.8900 \\
\hline 1978 & 4660.090 & 331.4500 & 34.25000 & 642.2700 & 567.7700 & 179.5900 \\
\hline 1977 & 5095． 370 & 391.1100 & 26．0．3000 & 782.8900 & \＄71．9100 & 216.1000 \\
\hline 1980 & 5016． 800 ／ & 456．4000 & 51.3 .3000 & 779.0200 & 610.0200 & 195.0700 \\
\hline 1981 & 5635.600 & 276.4500 & 39.36000 & 755.9500 & 629.6200 & 212.0800 \\
\hline 1982 & 485日．870 & 352.1500 & 51.58000 & 840.4400 & 649.2900 & 214.0700 \\
\hline 1793 & 4616.530 & 503．9300 & 31.93000 & B62． 9600 & ． 684.3400 & 287.2200 \\
\hline 1998 & 4915900 & 4．2 ： 7 ： & －on？\({ }^{\circ}\) & －38\％res & －597 0300 & 279.5800 \\
\hline 2.03 & \％う\％3， 5 & 4 4 ¢ 3 3 & & 丁， 3 － & 315.50 & 240－500 \\
\hline 1786 & 567日． 830 & 442.2900 & 17.47000 & 800.2800 & 402.4400 & 336.9600 \\
\hline 1987 & 565．3． 590 & 518.2500 & 18．99000 & 842.8600 & 416.3300 & 277．9200 \\
\hline 1968 & 6674．6日0 & 600，0000 & 21.29000 & 808.0700 & 465．1400 & 362．4200 \\
\hline 1997 & 6564．840 & 663.3000 & 33.53000. & 879.0 .300 & 489.7400 & 386． 5300 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline obs & QCHEM & QFET & GESM & GMACH & QELEC & QOTH \\
\hline 1975 & 159.7600 & 1329．590 & 466.6300 & 525.5600 & 207.4700 & 487.9400 \\
\hline 1976 & ． 350.0000 & 1294．600． & 71.3 .3500 & 220.8200 & 153．8600 & 531.1000 \\
\hline 1777 & 625．2900 & 1283．060 & 405.6300 & 231.2300 & ．20．63000 & 747．8400 \\
\hline 1\％\％ & 726.3000 & 1322．290 & 520．9800 & ． 354.2600 & 73.77000 ， & ． 444.3000 \\
\hline 1.979 & 668.0000 & 1396．460 & 611．9100 & 411．7600 & 103.8200 & 401.9300 \\
\hline 1900 & 760.8600 & 1370．120 & 033．7400． & ． 329.9700 & 126.3700 & 487.7100 \\
\hline 1991 & 681.1800 & 1283．7日0 & 634.8900 & 501.5300 & 312．5600 & 508．6200 \\
\hline 1402 & ． 586.1700 & 1.310 .370 & 695.1600 & 390．7800 & 217．6500 & 324．6000 \\
\hline 198.3 & 643．0200 & 1347.490 & 971.3100 & 4．34．3100 & 237.0100 & 567．8000 \\
\hline 19134 & 16．7． 1100 & 1346．270 & 1009．620 & 210．1600 & 293．6200 & 483．4400 \\
\hline 1965 & 557.1900 & 1149．540 & 1276．650 & 196.0900 & 439.2000 & 493.2800 \\
\hline 1906， & （SRK． 7700. & 1151.380 & 1279．8日0 & 212．6300 & 614.0700 & 509.0300 \\
\hline 1967 & 616.2400 & 1223．730 & 1312．120 & 259.1500 & 日 38.4000 & 529.0700 \\
\hline 1900 & 651.6900 & 1354.0930 & 1596．340 & 258.5300 & 732.6600 & 577．0300 \\
\hline 1485 & 528.4500 & 1401．250 & 1673．820 & 280．4900 & 739.4600 & 727．2200 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{APPENDIX}

Data Serfes Used in the RNE Submodel (cont'd)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline LFOUOD & LEEV & LTOB & LTEX & LFAF' & L.WCOC) \\
\hline 135.7390 & 19.77800 & 4.501000 & 94.77000 & 8.730000 & 56.73100 \\
\hline 129.4420 & 1.3 .14500 & 2.223000 & 102.1160 & 10.04600 & 65.94200 \\
\hline 154.7100 & 14.87400 & 3.091000 & 126.4360 & 10.61500 & 73.66500 \\
\hline 170.8540 & 17.45000 & 1.972000 & 295.9630 & 10.42100 & 75.75400 \\
\hline 167.6390 & 17.73100 & 1.317000 & 150.8650 & 13.06000 & 60.40100 \\
\hline 166:2070. & 19.43000 & 1.499000. & 157.4630 & 11.90000 & 70.29300 \\
\hline 181.7160 & 21.57900 & 1.21:5000 & 142.3360 & 11.41300 & 日G. 01.500 \\
\hline 175.1900 & 20.58200 & 1. 20.09000 & -137.4350 & 1.3.46200 & 79.601700 \\
\hline 140.9720 & 21.10200 & 3.254000 & 107.3530 & 12.46800 & 03.52100 \\
\hline 139.1390 & 20.06000 & 3.767000 & 1.12.5240 & 11.35800 & 74.09000 \\
\hline 145.6990 & 20.90700 & 3.827000 & 112.2150 & 7.909000 & 72.23700 \\
\hline 171.5300 & 17.12200 &  & 90, 07900 & \$1.24700 & 73.69300 \\
\hline 599\% pasp & 19-72600 & 2.,9\%ric &  &  & 78.23日00 \\
\hline 209.3340 & 20.79700 & 3.010000 & 114./480 & 13.80500 & 76.02700 \\
\hline 220.9440 & 21.72100 & 2.306000 & 121.4800 & 1.4 .04400 & 97.77500 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline LFET & LCHEM & LMACH & LESM & LELEC & LOTH \\
\hline 1.669000 & 10.22700 & 37.03700 & 1.822000 & 1.022000 & 19.54500 \\
\hline 1.127000 & 11.71900 & 26.97800 & 2.938000 & 2.221000 & 21.03200 \\
\hline 1.257000 & 18.16600 & 25.52600 & 3.255000 & 1.111000 & 29.48500 \\
\hline 2.237000 & 17.00400 & 43.01100 & 8.474000 & 4.402000 & 40.77900 \\
\hline 1.909000 & \(14.86600^{\circ}\) & 38.23200 & 5.267000 & 3.427000 & 31.01900 \\
\hline 1.4 .31000 & 19.14900 & 35.21800 & 6.634000 & 6.011000 & 31.92900 \\
\hline 1.939000 & 19.02000 & 37.43700 & 6.445000 & 5.157000 & 52.51200 \\
\hline 3.069000 & 15.31800 & 37.72200 & 7.125000 & 4.470000 & 29.03800 \\
\hline 2.290000 & 21.04500 & 31.74600 & 7.293000 & 5.683000 & 26.54700 \\
\hline 1.971000 & 15.30500 & 30.73600 & 7.164000 & 6.239000 & 26.11600 \\
\hline 2.497000 & 17.32600 & 30.17000 & 9.903001 & 6.700000 & 26.42500 \\
\hline 2.495000 & 14.77900 & 32.10500 & 9.640000 & 8.926000 & 27.48300 \\
\hline 2.501000 & 16.64000 & 35.30800 & 8.346000 & 11.36900 & 27.43000 \\
\hline 2.869000 & 21.89500 & 39.30800 & 9.890000 & 13.07200 & 40.55100 \\
\hline 2. 26.0000 & 20.30900 & 37.25600 & 9.479000 & 14.89700 & 39.37500 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{APPENDIX}

Data Series Used in the RNE Subnodel（cont＇d）
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline F－00D & PBEV & Prob & PTEX & PWOOD & PFAP \\
\hline 141．6000 & 109.2000 & 146．000\％ & 211.0430 & 172．5495 & 140．8925 \\
\hline 153．8000 & 246．9000 & 165.0000 & 253．3188 & 204．1814 & 154.3619 \\
\hline 164．2000 & 236.9000 & 104.1000 & 26日．0114 & 202.4460 & 166．2996 \\
\hline 178.5000 & 265.0000 & 197.2000 & 282．2903 & 274．5063 & 228.5588 \\
\hline 200.7000 & 200.4000 & 207.6000 & 334.6971 & 29．1．7364 & 251.3167 \\
\hline 230.4000 & 326.2000 & 232．8000 & 384．8339 & 536.1442 & 295．5726 \\
\hline 269.2000 & S66．0000 & 255.1000 & 425.9056 & 384．9591． & 316.9901 \\
\hline 298． 20000 & 412.7000 & 266． 9000 & 449．9767 & 408.2967 & 323.7869 \\
\hline 339.5000 & 454.7000 & 293．4000 & 507.0122 & 450． 5 549 & 358.5556 \\
\hline 432．4uje & OR & c\％－－ & \(\because \pi\)－598 & 659.4647 & 602.6167 \\
\hline 6413．400n & 1205 & & 76E & 725．\(-7 \rightarrow\) &  \\
\hline 656.1000 & 691.7000 & 696.1000 & 976．3873 & 754.1409 & 102.0794 \\
\hline 676.3000 & 752．8000 & ． 771.7000 & 10.30 .0 .31 & 788.7830 & 73.5131. \\
\hline 766.0000 & 859．0000 & 827.1000 & 1149.705 & E82．6770 & E34．6134 \\
\hline 860.7000 & 896.6000 & 988．2000 & 1204.604 & 741．9276 & 897．7520 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline FCHEM & FPET & PESM & FMACH & FELEC & POTH \\
\hline 167.5475 & 200．7000 & 144．5839 & 126.0674 & 124.4000 & 150.6780 \\
\hline 177.6172 & 291.8000 & 155.5527 & 132．2324． & 131.7000 & 180．0988 \\
\hline 191．0114 & 297.9000 & 162．6898 & 138.4784 & 138.4000 & 203．5137 \\
\hline 210．2786 & 301.1000 & 176.6197 & 149.4937 & 142.6000 & 238.1574 \\
\hline 222.1499 & 432．8000 & 197．6081 & 160.4231 & 152.1000 & 270.6987 \\
\hline 251．2736 & 694．5000 & 219．429日 & 180．4709 & 174.0000 & ． 320.1791 \\
\hline 261.8922 & 827.6000 & 235.4287 & 201．1325 & 20．3．0000 & 363．148日 \\
\hline 274．71：2 & 804.8000 & 256.6576 & 217．4803 & 227.4000 & 399．6723 \\
\hline 317.4607 & 962．3000 & 282．8840 & 241.0647 & 260.4000 & 430.7078 \\
\hline 567.8275 & 1523.700 & 421．0044 & 420．1500 & ． 326.1000 & 682.0557 \\
\hline 413.0165 & 1587．500 & 555．9091 & 546．7684 & 881．1000 & 874.6931 \\
\hline 679.1206 & 1．371．700 & 573.9705 & 550.6474 & 395.6000 & 945．6415 \\
\hline 718.6497 & 1350.000 & 605.9866 & 589.2701 & 409.1000 & 975．2229 \\
\hline 799.6435 & 1361.400 & 686.6741 & 645.8000 & 454.7000 & 1016．013： \\
\hline 034．7657 & 1354．000 & 797.5986 & 698.1987 & 502.5000 & 1179．795 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{APPENDIX}

Data Series Used in the RNE Submodel (cont'd)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline abs & KFOOD & KEEV & KTOB & KTEX & KFAF' & KNOOD \\
\hline 1975 & 2662.000 & 99.00000 & 8. 740000 & 1431.980 & 401.9700 & 700.7600 \\
\hline 1976 & 1287.000 & 92.00000 & 13.29000 & 660.0500 & 570.2800 & 460.0900 \\
\hline 1977 & 1815.000 & 243.0000 & 1.5.49000 & 554.6100 & 222.3800 & 364.7400 \\
\hline L978. & -2293.000 & 169.0000 & 7.700000 & 830.9100 & 323.7800 & 518.8200 \\
\hline 1979 & 2512.000 & 428.0000 & \(16.0 \leq 000\) & 2023.940 & 540.1800 & 592.6000 \\
\hline 1980 & 1725.000 & 202.0000 & 12.53000 & 709.7200 & 308.0300 & 6.15 .4000 \\
\hline 1981 & 1968.000 & 320.0000 & 7.870000 & 419.5000 & 162.5600 & 1285.740 \\
\hline 1982 & 2147.000 & 573.0000 & 5.660000 & 525.4900 & 124.2300 & 315.6000 \\
\hline 1985 & 3088.000 & 699.0000 & 9.680000 & 351.5400 & 202.9200 & 316.2200 \\
\hline 1984 & 924.0000 & 1090.000 & 7.020000 & 145.5200 & 277.1600 & 426.0800 \\
\hline -985 & 621.000n & ィ9\% 5000 & 6.850090 & \$86.8000 & 35.93000 & 161.4900 \\
\hline ᄃ980 & at 4 \% &  & 4 \% morturis &  & 19.0800 & \(244 \times 500\) \\
\hline 1987 & 733.0000 & 192.0000 & 3.350000 & 707.0200 & 07.37063 & 22.3586 \\
\hline 1998 & 1432.000 & 306.0000 & 1.420000 & 981.1900 & 83,15000 & 227.5800 \\
\hline 1.797 & 11.57 .000 & 422.0000 & 9.330000 & 691.8000 & 88.89800 & 245.3700 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 5 & KFET & KCHEM & KMACH & KESM & KELEC & KOTH \\
\hline 1975 & 463.1300 & 243.1000 & 442.3100 & 30.70000 & 18.77000 & 625.4800 \\
\hline 1.976 & 262.5400 & 783.8300 & 231.6200 & 39.35000 & 43.63000 & 1507.020 \\
\hline 1977 & \$66.2900 & 585.0700 & 165.3700 & 9\%.05000 & 12.79000 & 482.7400 \\
\hline 1978 & 644.3400 & 311.6600 & 389.0300 & 219.6000 & 36.90000 & 440.8700 \\
\hline 1979 & 535.5200 & 522.4300 & 522.6100 & 37.73000 & 59.77000 & 346.7000 \\
\hline 1.960 & \$56.5000 & 1317.580 & 417.3600 & 1035.470 & 66.11000 & 1451.970 \\
\hline 1981 & 306.1500 & 1352.570 & 269.8000 & 21.46 .220 & 86.74000 & 1007.880 \\
\hline 1982 & 456.1100 & 561.0800 & 170.5600 & 2105.670 & 84.75000 & 798.3900 \\
\hline 1983 & 209.0500 & 408.2700 & 291.5600 & 108.0700 & 87.84000 & 744.5.100 \\
\hline 1984 & 248.9000 & 309.7800 & 99.28000 & 253.6700 & 67.49000 & 625.3000 \\
\hline 1985 & 441.9500 & 253.9100 & 87.15000 & 108\%.980 & 129.6700 & 300.1600 \\
\hline 1986 & 742.3400 & 1774.350 & 106.5600 & 1536.770 & 416.4700 & 195.1900 \\
\hline 1987 & 760.2300 & 530.3800 & 220.9000 & 631.1300 & 540.2500 & 175.7900 \\
\hline 1988 & 598.4200 & 372.4100 & 75.43000 & 2695.160 & 642.2900 & 284.8000 \\
\hline 1797 & 594.0100 & 217.9700 & 1855.8000 & 762.5800 & 327.5700 & 404.7500 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{APPENDIX}

\section*{Data Series Used in the RNE Submodel (cont'd)}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline obs & XFOOD & XBE & XTOE & XTEX & KF'AF & XWOOD \\
\hline 1.9\%5 & 4750.000 & 5.260000 & 136.5000 & 334956.0 & 10.54000 & 119 \\
\hline 1976 & 4481.000 & 6.460000 & 121.0600 & 644805.0 & 11.94000 & 18.13 \\
\hline 1977 & 5444.000 & 4.000000 & 114.9500 & 735288.0 & 17.94000 & 1.696 \\
\hline 1978 & 4.442 .000 & 7.770000 & 111.6000 & 980371.0 & 18.69000 & 2022.000 \\
\hline 1979 & 4211.000 & 5.900000 & 103.4000 & 1124257 & 2 E .8000 & 2774.000 \\
\hline 1980 & 4215.000 & 4.260000 & 81.22000 & 1258303 & 25.66000 & 2250.000 \\
\hline 1981 & 3584.000 & 9.720000 & 122.390 & 1297300 & 29.58000 & 1789.00 \\
\hline 1982 & 2681.000 & 6.670000 & 114.3400 & 917783.0 & 34.70000 & 14.19.000 \\
\hline 1983 & 2187.000 & 5.480000 & 69.34000 & 893460.0 & 25.23000 & 1390.000 \\
\hline 1984 & 1516.000 & 3.620000 & 40.52000 & 493956.0 & 17.44000 & 757.0000 \\
\hline & \(07 \%-{ }^{-75}\) & \(\cdots \times\) & 78.45000 & 38: 8444.0 & 14.12000 & 4e\% 9no \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{4}\) & r. 20. & 3.220000 & \(2-38000\) & 16ec & 15.77000 & 3uramo \\
\hline 1987 & 726.0000 & 4.930000 & 21.60000 & 504338.0 & 13.46000 & 631.0000 \\
\hline 1988 & 684.0000 & 4.770000 & 22.97000 & 579990.0 & 19.65000 & 670.0000 \\
\hline 1989 & 542.0000 & 4.620000 & 21.38000 & 683074.0. & 24.23000 & 858.0000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline obs & XFET & XCHEM & XMACH & XeSM & XELEC & XOTH \\
\hline 1975 & 96071.00 & 86650.00 & 3756日.00 & 1499870. & 186.2400 & 836035.0 \\
\hline 1976 & 96071.00 & 125437.0 & 74908.00 & 1620949. & 36.3 .3200 & 1456148. \\
\hline 1977 & 75705.00 & 211141.0 & 110737.0 & 2085873. & 497.4400 & 1523215. \\
\hline 1978 & 35947.00 & 231297.0 & 146455.0 & 2104197. & 939.7100 & 2002121. \\
\hline 1979 & 34115.00 & 351511.0 & 153786.0 & 2701108. & 127\%.060 & 2453709. \\
\hline 1980 & 134654.0 & 250991.0 & 142858.0 & 3360442. & 1807.080 & 3101072. \\
\hline 1981 & 102685.0 & 264713.0 & 12651.2 .0 & 2254266. & 1961.970 & 3550889. \\
\hline 1982 & 78004.00 & 236537.0 & 118920.0 & 1495983. & 2250.580 & 3562146. \\
\hline 1983 & 229356.0 & 493966.0 & 78069.00 & 1136571. & 1975.440 & 2905487. \\
\hline 1984 & 112392.0 & 299193.0 & 55782.00 & 586408.0 & 1669.620 & 237546. \\
\hline 1995 & 41765.00 & 2627日2.0 & 37144.00 & 534157.0 & 1020.020 & 1564674 \\
\hline 1986 & 65880.00 & 363812.0 & 53982.00 & 1.047842. & 910.8700 & 1497050. \\
\hline 1997 & 90950.00 & 351830.0 & 80064.00 & 420915.0 & 1025.750 & 1801696. \\
\hline 1988 & 132275.0 & 30105s.0 & 49855.00 & 665990.0 & 1140.930 & 2300343. \\
\hline 1989 & 187493.0 & 371494.0 & 52710.00 & 1058758. & 1269.040 & 23803540 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{APPENDIX}

Data Series Used in the RNE Submodel (cont'd)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Ots & DVE4日6 & DVE499 & WF: I & CF'I \\
\hline 1975 & 0.000000 & 0.000000 & 197.9800 & 1.66 .9000 \\
\hline 1976 & 0.000000 & 0.000000 & 218.6600 & 182.3000 \\
\hline 1.977 & 0.000000 & 0.000000 & 234.7100 & 200.4000 \\
\hline 1.978 & 0.000000 & 0.000000 & 246.2400 & 215.0000 \\
\hline 1979 & 0.000000 & 0.000000 & 293.0200 & 250.5000 \\
\hline 1980 & 0.000000 & 0.000000 & 346.7000 & 294.6000 \\
\hline 1981 & 0.000000 & 0.000000 & 396.6900 & 33.1000 \\
\hline 1982 & 0.000000 & 0.000000 & 440.7700 & E64.9000 \\
\hline 1983 & 0.000000 & 0.000000 & 512.1700 & 402.0000 \\
\hline 1784 & 1.000000 & - 0 0000 & 它3\% & -6t34.4060 \\
\hline 1985 & 1. 000000 & 1.000000 & 1007.850 & 744.0200 \\
\hline 1796 & 1.000000 & 1.000000 & 992.0900 & 749.6100 \\
\hline 1987 & 0.000000 & 1.000000 & 1092.210 & 779.0500 \\
\hline 1988 & 0.000000 & 1.000000 & 1227.490 & 846.2100 \\
\hline .1989 & 0.000000 & 1.000000 & 1359.250 & 935.8900 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline obs & DV8989 & TIME & [ NFFL. & ER & XGAFMF & L.TOT \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 1975 & 0.000000 & 1.000000 & 6.758700 & 7.247900 & 1473.000 & 391.2710 \\
\hline 1976 & 0.000000 & 2.000000 & 9.228700 & 7.440300 & 2451.000 & 809.6790 \\
\hline 1977 & 0.000000 & 3.000000 & 9.918400 & 7.402800 & 2584.000 & 462.6110 \\
\hline 1978 & 0.000000 & 4.000000 & 7.315800 & 7.368800 & 4226.000 & 720.4030 \\
\hline 1979 & . 0.000000 & 5.000000 & 16.50520 & 7.577600 & 57.26 .000 & 517.7530 \\
\hline 1.980 & 0.000000 & 6.000000 & 1.7.61210 & 7.511400 & 8330.000 & 527.1190 \\
\hline 1981 & 0.000000 & 7.600000 & 12.37870 & 7.999700 & 9874.000 & 549.6020 \\
\hline 1992 & 0.000000 & 8.000000 & 10.20220 & 0.540000 & 8936.000 & 525.6990 \\
\hline 1993 & 0.000000 & 7.000000 & 10.17540 & 11.1.270 & 8662.000 & 465.2440 \\
\hline 1964 & 0.000000 & 10.00000 & 50.34240 & 16.69970 & 12236.00 & 447.4750 \\
\hline 1785 & 0.000000 & 1.1.00000 & 2 x .10720 & 10.60730 & 12051.00 & 45\%.7180 \\
\hline 1986 & 0.000000 & 12.00000 & 0.750000 & 20.38570 & 14894.00 & 462.9710 \\
\hline 1987 & 0.000000 & 1. 3.00000 & 3.791600 & 20.56770 & 17183.00 & 400.4480 \\
\hline 1.988 & 1. 600000 & 14.00000 & 0.759700 & 21.09700 & 22SE6.00 & 596.2080 \\
\hline 1997 & 1.000000 & 15.00000 & 10.60410 & 21.72000 & 26.396 .00 & 604.0840 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```
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