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TRADE LIBERALIZATION: THE IMPACT ON UTAH’S DAIRY AND MEAT INDUSTRIES

Introduction

The United States is an efficient and low-cost agricultural producer demonstrated by huge domestic agricultural surpluses and exports. This is a partial reason however for the crisis now facing American agriculture: we can produce more agricultural products than can be sold at prices which provide a reasonable profit (Johnson). While the problem is quite clear, the solution is not.

It is generally agreed upon that a partial solution to the woes of American agriculture would be global trade liberalization in agricultural products thereby expanding foreign export markets (Johnson). But trade liberalization is not a one-way street; agricultural trade liberalization by the United States and its trading partners would also open up U.S. markets now protected by import restrictions. Two U.S. agricultural industries that are heavily protected from imports and therefore would be subject to greater import competition after trade liberalization are the dairy and meat industries. However, even in this case trade liberalization is an attractive policy because of the huge costs import restrictions now impose on consumers. It is estimated that U.S. import restraints on dairy and meat products cost U.S. consumers $5.5 and $1.8 billion respectively in 1984 (Hufbauer et al.).

A policy of global trade liberalization in agricultural products is of significant interest to Utah since 75 percent of Utah farm cash receipts are derived from dairy and meat products (Utah Agricultural Statistics). It appears that while trade liberalization would benefit American agriculture overall, it would hurt Utah agriculture. But the effect of
increased import competition on Utah's dairy and meat industries would be
mitigated by an increase in foreign demand for these products. This is
because U.S. trading partners also have import restrictions on dairy and
meat products and the United States presently exports as well as imports
commodities in both product groups (see Biswas and Tribedy).

The purpose of this article is to quantitify the effects of complete
trade liberalization in dairy and meat products by the United States,
Japan, and the European Economic Community (EEC) on Utah's dairy and meat
industries and overall economy. The information presented will enable
Utah's congressional delegation to better make decisions on trade policy
issues now facing the nation and inform the producers of dairy and meat
products what the effects of trade liberalization would be on their
industries.

Methodology

A mathematical model is used that calculates the increase in U.S.
imports and exports from the United States, Japan and the EEC completely
eliminating trade barriers for the following commodities: (1) nonfat dry
milk; (2) cheese; (3) butter; and (4) bovine meat. The calculations are
based on the following method: The percentage of increase in import value
equals the percentage change in the import price to the consumer caused by
complete trade barrier elimination, multiplied by the price elasticity of
demand for imports. The percentage decline in the price of the import to
the consumer equals the tariff equivalent of the trade barriers divided by
unity plus the tariff equivalent. The price elasticity of import demand
represents the percentage change in demand for imports for each percentage
change in the consumer price of the imports. The percentage increase in
import value is then multiplied by the base year of imports to give the
increase in imports of that particular commodity.

To calculate the increase in U.S. exports, the model merely adopts the
mirror image of the import calculations: one country's increase in imports
is another country's increase in exports. The overall increase in U.S.
exports of a given commodity is determined by adding up the importing
countries' increases in imports. To translate the trade effects into
changes in domestic production we assume that for a given trade change
there will be a corresponding change that takes place fully on the side of
production; increased imports are treated as representing a decrease in
domestic production by an amount equal to the increase in imports;
increased exports are treated as causing an increase in production
equivalent to the increase in exports.

The production loss or gain is estimated at the national level. Utah's share of the gain or loss is then calculated based on Utah's share
in national production of the particular commodity in question. The gains
and losses are then summed up to arrive at a net production gain or loss
for Utah's dairy and meat industries. After the production changes within
the dairy and meat industries are estimated, multipliers derived from an
input-output model are used to translate the production changes into
effects on output, employment, and income in Utah's economy.

RESULTS

Structural Adjustments

Tables 1 and 2 show the data used to estimate and the resulting estimates of the impact of complete trade liberalization in dairy and meat products by the United States, Japan, and the EEC on United States and
Table 1. Effect on U.S. Imports, U.S. Production, and Utah Production of Meat and Dairy Products from Trade Liberalization in these Products, ($1,000,000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meat¹</td>
<td>011.1</td>
<td>1,302.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk²</td>
<td>022</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>024</td>
<td>403.7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>2.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dairy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>196.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Bovine meat.
²Nonfat dry milk.

Table 2. Effect on U.S. Exports, U.S. Production, and Utah Production of Meat and Dairy Products from Trade Liberalization in these Products, ($1,000,000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>253.4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>140.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>141.4</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dairy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>159.8</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: see Table 1
Utah’s production of these two commodities; Table 1 shows the increase in imports and Table 2 the increase in exports.

Utah’s meat production loss would be around $0.76 million while its production gain would be at least $1.13 million. It appears, therefore, that trade liberalization in meat products would not significantly affect Utah’s meat industry. It needs to be noted however, that we are using only one rather broad category of meat (SITC 011.1) in our model, hence within this category some particular products may suffer stiffer import competition while others benefit from greater foreign demand.

For Utah’s dairy industry, it is estimated that the production loss and gain would approximately offset each other in milk and butter with the only significant effect occurring in cheese. The significant impact on cheese is due both to Utah being a large producer of cheese and cheese being a large U.S. import. The production loss in cheese would be around $2.4 million while the production gain would be only around a quarter of a million dollars. It appears that trade liberalization would cause Utah’s dairy product processors to shift more towards the production of butter and nonfat dry milk and away from cheese as a consequence of trade liberalization in these products.

Net Production Effect

Utah’s meat industry would realize a net production gain of around $0.366 million. Utah’s dairy industry on the other hand would lose around $2.179 million of production to imports. Therefore, Utah’s combined two industries would suffer a net production loss of around $2 million from complete trade liberalization in these products by the United States, Japan, and the EEC.
Direct and Multiplier Effects

Using job-output ratios and income per job data the above production changes in the two industries were translated into direct effects on employment and income in the dairy and meat industries. Multipliers were then used to translate those direct effects into total effects on output, employment and income in Utah's economy. Table 3 contains the above specified data.

As an examination of Table 3 will reveal, the dairy industry would lose around 30 jobs and the meat industry would gain a couple of jobs from trade liberalization. There would be a combined net effect of around 28 jobs lost in the combined industries with a corresponding loss of $245,532 of income.

Of course the above direct effects on the two industries translate into larger effects on Utah's economy through the multiplier effect. Table 3 shows that the total output effect in Utah's economy from trade liberalization in dairy and meat products would be around a $3.73 million loss. In addition around 68 jobs would be lost and $0.56 million of income would be lost in the state. For comparison, the average number of employed persons in Utah in 1984 was 646,000, and the total labor and proprietors income in 1983 was $10,915,247,000 (University of Utah, 1985). Hence, the job loss from trade liberalization would amount to around 0.01 percent of total employment and about that same percentage of total income would be lost due to trade liberalization in meat dairy products.

Conclusions

The above analysis points out that trade liberalization in meat and dairy products would cause structural adjustments to occur in Utah's dairy and meat industries as production shifted away from cheese to butter and
Table 3. Direct and Multiplier Effects on Output, Employment, and Income in Utah's Economy from Total Trade Liberalization in Dairy and Meat Products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Direct Effects on Particular Industry</th>
<th>Total Effect via the Respective Multiplier on Utah's Economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output ($1,000,000)</td>
<td>Employment (Jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>-2.179</td>
<td>-30.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>-27.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data in Tables 1 and 2 and data by Keith et al.
dry milk. But the net effect on the two industries and Utah's economy would be slight. The impact on the dairy industry workers who lose their jobs to increased input competition is however very significant. Furthermore, the income these workers lose while looking for new employment is a real cost to society. The overall increase in dairy product imports will also put downward pressure on their prices which may in the short run lower the return to the factor used intensively in producing dairy products (labor).
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