

Impact of trade liberalization on Government Revenue

Hina Amir

**Lecturer, Department of Management Sciences,
COMSATS Institute of Information
Technology Lahore Pakistan.**

Sana Iftikhar

**PhD Scholar, Department of Economics,
National College of Business Administration & Economics (NCBA&E)**

Abstract

Unrestricted trade stimulates economic growth and bridges socio-economic gaps existing in different countries of the world. Pakistan has adopted trade liberalization policies since the late 1980s with the same expectations. This study has empirically analyzed how trade liberalization has affected economic development in the country. Its effects have been examined with respect to four measures of economic development: per capita GDP, income inequality, poverty and employment over the period from 1984-2010. The main analysis is based on a simultaneous equation model. Keeping in view the simultaneity of the chosen development measures, the model is estimated with the VAR technique. The analysis shows that, over the study period, trade liberalization has not affected all the chosen indicators of development uniformly. The focus of trade liberalization should be to bring about improvement in the performance of mediating factors and to focus exports on labor-intensive products.

I. Introduction

The world is rapidly transforming into a global village. Trade has contributed to this transformation more significantly than any other factor. In fact, the high economic, social, cultural, political, human and intellectual integration witnessed in the world in the recent past is due primarily, though not exclusively, to trade among its different countries. Further, trade has contributed much more to the development of the world economies than any other factor. It is because different nations interact with each other through trade that it tends to bring about the desired change through the exchange of goods, services, skills, knowledge and expertise. In the process, trade increases the availability of choices, improves the level and distribution of income, increases opportunities for enhancement of technical capacities and finally motivates people to accelerate the process of change in their countries. This desired process of change signifies development. Development, in turn, is manifested in the enhanced work capacity of the people, augmented empowerment of individuals and thereby, high rates of participation in productive activities. Thus, trade and development go hand in hand and therefore the strategies adopted in the case of the former have a strong bearing on the latter.

A number of market-oriented moves have surged during the last couple of decades in the world. In the wake of these moves, the global trend has also witnessed the liberalization of the capital account, foreign exchange, credit, domestic consumption and trade in different countries. However, the area which has received unprecedented emphasis in various economies is trade liberalization. Trade liberalization denotes the reduction in barriers to the movement of goods and services in international trade. In the words of Bhagwati and Krueger, "any policy which reduces the anti-export bias will lead towards liberalization of trade" and reduction in the import license premium is the fundamental step towards a liberalized trade regime.¹ A new explanation by Edwards (1993) describes a liberal trade regime as one in which all trade distortions including import tariffs and export subsidies are completely eliminated.

The new growth theory argues that trade liberalization expands the market, induces an increase in research and development, reallocates employment to more innovative activities that require more human capital and increases knowledge flow among countries. Other than benefits, some costs are also associated with trade liberalization. A substantial problem arising from reducing trade barriers in the wake of trade liberalization is the loss in tariff revenue that accounts for 10-20 percent of government revenue in developing countries. If tariffs are reduced or eliminated, these countries will have to impose large increases in other taxes in order to keep their budgets in line, causing some economic distortions. The move to trade liberalization is also likely to lead to large

disruptions in agriculture. If barriers to agricultural imports are removed too quickly, it can lead to large-scale displacement of the rural population. Standard economic models implicitly assume that these people are re-employed in other sectors of the economy, but rapid liberalization can lead to substantial unemployment and underemployment, as well as dangerous levels of social and economic instability. This may also lead to an uneven distribution of gains and pains, where the gains are distributed across the economy, while the burdens of adjustments are borne mainly by a particular group as put forward by the Human Development Report (2003).

In fact, trade liberalization has become the key element of any development policy since the late 1970s when economic policy at the global level underwent certain fundamental changes. The formation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995 provided an impetus to the process of trade liberalization. It provides a platform for negotiating trade related disputes among different countries of the world. The basic purpose of this organization is to facilitate the process of liberalizing trade and other trade related aspects at the international level.

As expected, different countries use different approaches for acquiring gains from trade liberalization. For example, East Asian countries moved towards an outward development strategy of import substitution and government control by the mid-1960s. This change in development strategies enabled these countries not only to improve their gross domestic product growth rate, exports and living standards but also enabled them to sustain their development during the years of the oil shock in the 1970s as well as in the debt and recession years of the early 1980s. Consequently, their per capita income was four to five times higher in the 1990s than in the 1960s. More specifically, the per capita incomes of Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan rose at an annual rate of 6.2 percent, 7.1 percent, 6.5 percent, and 8.1 percent respectively, in the period 1965-1990 (Behrman and Srinivasan, 1995).

A vast body of literature provides ample evidence of significant contributions, either positive or negative, of trade liberalization to the development of the world. For instance, Greenaway *et al.* (2002) conducted a study to analyze the relationship between trade liberalization and the growth rate of GDP for 73 developing countries. This cross-country analysis was based on three different measurements of liberalization: First through non-tariff barriers, average tariff, black market exchange rate premium, whether the economy is socialist or not, and whether state monopoly exists over major exports; Secondly, through level of quotas, tariff, and export impediments and promoters and exchange rate misalignment; Lastly, with a dummy variable for the structural adjustment program, a World Bank (WB) indicator.

Empirical results of this study were obtained by using the ordinary least squares (OLS) technique with three different time periods for three different indicators. Results obtained for the short run from the first two indicators showed the positive and significant impact of trade liberalization on growth while the WB indicator showed an insignificant impact of trade liberalization on growth. Moreover results from all indicators showed that liberalization affects the growth rate of GDP with a lag in the long run.

Similarly, Kemal *et. al.*, (2002) empirically tested the macroeconomic determinants of growth in Pakistan by taking into account the variables supposed to have the most significant impact on the growth rate such as investment in physical capital, population growth, government consumption, inflation and trade liberalization. The OLS technique of estimation was used for the time period 1959-60 to 2000-01. Empirical results showed that openness appeared to have an insignificant impact on economic growth due to inconsistent and unavailable data on many other important variables, and a variety of political, institutional and infrastructure problems faced by Pakistan. A common argument of both these studies discussed above is that trade liberalization affects different aspects of economic development differently due to different government policies and institutional factors. The specifications of models and techniques of their estimation also show different effects of trade liberalization. This conclusion is also supported by some other studies as well.

The study of Irwin *et. al.*, (2002) investigating the relationship between trade liberalization and income growth for countries engaged in bilateral trade for different time periods, demonstrated that more open economies enjoy a higher level of per capita income. This study used the instrumental variable (IV) technique of estimation. Mohsin *et. al.* (2001) aimed to explain the impact of openness on the poverty level in Pakistan for the time period 1963-64 to 1993-94. The study demonstrates that poverty has declined with trade liberalization in Pakistan using the head count index method for measuring poverty and the sum of imports and exports as a percentage of GDP for openness. Similarly, Yang and Huang (1997) suggest that a decline in the economy wide tariff leads towards more equitable distribution of income in China using a Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) model.

Moreover, Waczaig (2001) carried out an empirical investigation for the indirect linkages between trade liberalization and growth by first checking the impact of the former on six different channels of growth and then the effect of these channels on the latter for 57 countries during the time period 1970-1989.3 Using the simultaneous equations technique the parameters were jointly estimated through three stage least squares. Results of the study demonstrated that trade openness

has a positive impact on growth through five determinants, namely the black market premium, manufactured exports, investment rate, foreign direct investment, macro policy quality, while it has a negative but insignificant impact on growth through government size (measured by government consumption). Investment appears to be the most significant channel through which trade liberalization affects growth.

Most of the studies reviewed so far have analyzed the impact on different indicators of development separately. Mainly economic growth is considered as the main indicator of development ignoring all other aspects or dimensions of development. The positive relationship between trade liberalization and economic growth is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for development, and several other factors must be taken into consideration to find out the impact of trade liberalization on economic development.

This study has tried to take into account the most crucial elements of development such as per capita GDP, income inequality measured by the Gini coefficient, the poverty level, and employment over the period from 1960-2003 for Pakistan. This study provides recent evidence for the impact of trade liberalization on the economy of Pakistan using a simultaneous equations model keeping in view the simultaneity of various factors.

The rest of the study is organized as follows: Trade policies announced so far in Pakistan with reference to liberalization are discussed in detail in the second part of the study. The third part presents the model specification and estimation procedure. In the fourth part, data and construction of different variables are discussed. Empirical results are explained in the fifth part. The final section concludes the study and lists certain policy implications.

II. Historical Review of Trade Liberalization in Pakistan

The early years of Pakistan's economy can be characterized by a weak industrial base, dominance of the agriculture sector, lack of well-organized infrastructure, and above all eco-political instability. The main objective of the policies of those years was to strengthen the industrial base. To this end, Pakistan adopted a restricted trade regime and protected its domestic industries with high tariff and non-tariff barriers. The period of the sixties was the period in which the industrial base was laid and in which rapid expansion of large scale manufacturing industries started in the country. While the highly protected trade regime remained effective in this period, some additional policies were introduced to encourage industrial exports from the country: an overvalued exchange rate,

export bonuses, preferential credit access to industries with export potential and automatic renewal of import licenses. Consequently, both industrial production and exports registered a reasonable increase during the 1960s. However, industrial expansion did not continue at the same rate in the next decade. In fact, it suffered a setback in the next decade due to the nationalization of industries. Although the government nationalized different types of industries in the country, it took three additional trade liberalization measures to encourage exports during this period: devaluation of the Pakistani Rupee by 57% in 1972, elimination of the export bonus scheme, and the discontinuation of restrictive licensing scheme. These steps stimulated exports especially of manufactured products.

Although trade policies were modified continuously in Pakistan, changes of particular significance were made after the formulation of the new trade policy in 1987. After the incorporation of the other changes, the trade policy led, inter alia, to a reduction in tariff slabs from 17 to 10 and introduction of a uniform tax in place of commodity based sales taxes. In fact, the government focused in this decade mainly on enhancing the role of private sector in the economy, increasing the competitiveness and efficiency of the domestic industrial sector, and promoting exports. The specific measures that the government took in pursuance of these objectives related to the provision of different fiscal incentives such as tax holidays, tariff cuts and other profit augmenting opportunities to the exporter. More specifically, the maximum tariff was reduced from 225 percent in 1986-87 to 70 percent in 1994-95. Similarly, the number of custom duty slabs was reduced from 13 to 5. Further, the flexible exchange rate system introduced earlier was kept in effect during this decade.

The years 2000-2003 have witnessed the introduction of such policies as promotion of liberalization, deregulation, and reduction in the cost of doing business; these policies have laid equal emphasis on encouraging a stable macro-economic framework in terms of inflation, interest rate and exchange rate. Further, they have also concentrated on the promotion of export of services, which had not received proportional attention in the past. In fact, they have made the promotion of services an integral component of the overall trade policy of the country, so much so that the government has set export and import targets of US \$ 12.1 and 12.8 billion for the current year. The achievement of these targets will reduce the trade deficit of the country to less than US\$ 1.0 billion (GOP, 2004).

III. Model Specification and Estimation Procedure

The effect of trade liberalization on the economic development of Pakistan is to be measured as mentioned before, by its effects on the level of per capita gross domestic product, poverty, inequality of income distribution and employment. These indicators are taken from the definition of development presented by Dudley Seers in 1972.

Theoretically, these indicators of development are assumed to affect and to be affected by each other. For example, employment level and per capita GDP are mutually dependent on each other. Similarly, per capita GDP and the Gini coefficient, according to Kuznet's hypothesis, are interdependent. In econometric terms such interdependence among the endogenous variables gives rise to the problem of simultaneity across them. As such, simultaneity among the chosen variables necessitates the formulation of the model and its estimation in a way that the analysis yields valid results. To this end, we have specified a simultaneous equations model, as shown below, and estimated by using the VAR technique.

$$LPGDP_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 EMP_t + \gamma_2 LHK_t + \gamma_3 LINV_t + \gamma_4 LTL_t + \gamma_5 P + \epsilon_t$$

Where P denotes poverty, $PGDP$ per capita gross domestic product, EMP employed labor-force, inflation is measured by the CPI index, HK human capital, INV ratio of domestic investment to GDP , and TL trade liberalization. Equation determines the impact of trade liberalization on $PGDP$.

How the variables included in the model are formulated is explained below.

Variables	Description
Per capita Gross Domestic Product	GDP is the value of all the final goods and services produced in Pakistan during a year. PGDP is determined by dividing the GDP by population of the country.
Poverty	Poverty for the purpose of this study is measured by Head Count Ratio Index.
Employment Level	Employed labor force is that portion of the total labor force which is employed in paid jobs and self-employed.
Human Capital	Human capital is measured and represented by primary level enrollment rates (in thousands) for the whole economy.
Inflation	Inflation is defined as the annual rate of increase in prices and is represented by the Consumer Price Index.
Gross Investment GDP ratio	It accounts for both the public and private investment that has taken place in the economy over the study period.
Trade Liberalization	Two measures are used to measure trade liberalization. First, the trade-GDP ratio that is obtained by dividing the sum of exports and imports by GDP. Second, import duties as percentage of total imports.

The analysis is based on the national time series data for the time period from 1984 to 2010. All the variables used in the study are measured in millions of rupees at constant market prices with 1990-91 as the base year. For some of the years, data was missing for poverty. The data is collected from different sources. The *Pakistan Economic Survey* (various issues) was used for data collection on poverty, GDP, Consumer Price Index, human capital, employed labor force, imports, exports and GDP deflator.

Estimation Technique

The model under consideration is constrained to be over identified. Therefore, it is estimated with the OLS method. The basic idea behind OLS is to replace the endogenous explanatory variable by a linear combination of the predetermined variables in the model and use them as explanatory variables instead of the original endogenous variables. The OLS method thus resembles the instrumental variable method of estimation in that the linear combination of the predetermined variables serves as an instrument, or a proxy for the endogenous variables.

IV. Empirical Results and Interpretation

Empirical results of the model, in which the openness index (sum of export and import as a percentage of GDP) is used to represent trade liberalization, are reported in Table 1.

Estimations of variables:

Table 1 Vector Error Correction Estimates

Cointegrating Eq:	CointEq1
TRADE_LIBERLIZATION(-1)	1.000000
POVERTY(-1)	-1.84E-09 (4.4E-10) [4.13567]
INFLATION(-1)	-0.725683 (0.04555) [-15.9305]
HUMAN_CAPITAL(-1)	0.430002 (0.017086) [-2.51674]

EMPLOYMENT_LEVEL(-1)	0.226240 (0.02496) [9.06252]				
C	-29.42433				
Error Correction:	D(TRADE_LIBERLIZATION)	D(POVERTY)	D(INFLATION)	D(HUMAN_C APITAL)	D(EMPLOYM ENT_LEVEL)
CointEq1	-0.505307 (0.087974) [-0.57438]	-5.48E+08 (2.3E+08) [-2.40725]	1.539067 (1.24338) [1.23781]	-0.009289 (0.48860) [-0.01901]	-0.336694 (0.41290) [-0.81544]
D(TRADE_LIBERLIZATION (-1))	-0.045963 (0.47727) [-0.09630]	4.20E+08 (1.2E+08) [3.40164]	-0.580641 (0.67455) [-0.86079]	0.289271 (0.26507) [1.09129]	0.213405 (0.22400) [0.95269]
D(TRADE_LIBERLIZATION (-2))	0.130400 (0.26854) [0.48558]	1.41E+08 (6.9E+07) [2.03022]	0.109302 (0.37954) [0.28798]	0.055258 (0.14915) [0.37049]	-0.041170 (0.12604) [-0.32665]
D(POVERTY(-1))	1.51E-09 (1.3E-09) [1.18342]	0.531084 (0.33100) [1.60447]	-1.25E-09 (1.8E-09) [-0.69170]	1.66E-09 (7.1E-10) [2.33319]	4.35E-10 (6.0E-10) [0.72443]
D(POVERTY(-2))	2.22E-09 (1.0E-09) [2.18521]	0.129629 (0.26278) [0.49330]	-6.47E-10 (1.4E-09) [-0.45043]	1.55E-09 (5.6E-10) [2.74745]	-1.29E-10 (4.8E-10) [-0.27133]
D(INFLATION(-1))	-0.082524 (0.37371) [-0.22082]	-2.15E+08 (9.7E+07) [-2.22332]	0.209981 (0.52819) [0.39755]	0.021838 (0.20756) [0.10521]	-0.098143 (0.17540) [-0.55954]
D(INFLATION(-2))	0.301304 (0.25867) [1.16483]	-1.05E+08 (6.7E+07) [-1.57662]	0.190758 (0.36559) [0.52178]	0.017311 (0.14366) [0.12050]	0.046948 (0.12140) [0.38671]
D(HUMAN_CAPITAL(-1))	0.376800 (0.61111) [0.61658]	1.37E+08 (1.6E+08) [0.86454]	-0.145760 (0.86370) [-0.16876]	-0.398182 (0.33941) [-1.17317]	0.403599 (0.28682) [1.40717]
D(HUMAN_CAPITAL(-2))	-0.356376 (0.73543) [-0.48458]	-1.27E+08 (1.9E+08) [-0.66937]	0.553328 (1.03941) [0.53235]	-0.552695 (0.40845) [-1.35314]	0.098568 (0.34517) [0.28557]

D(EMPLOYMENT_LEVEL(-1))	-0.394001 (0.78840) [-0.49975]	4.01E+08 (2.0E+08) [1.96841]	-2.228488 (1.11427) [-1.99995]	-0.365241 (0.43787) [-0.83413]	0.125854 (0.37003) [0.34012]
D(EMPLOYMENT_LEVEL(-2))	-0.062898 (1.13406) [-0.05546]	5.71E+08 (2.9E+08) [1.94583]	-0.600093 (1.60281) [-0.37440]	0.003170 (0.62985) [0.00503]	0.699901 (0.53226) [1.31497]
C	0.314202 (1.59935) [0.19646]	-7.96E+08 (4.1E+08) [-1.92511]	2.862179 (2.26043) [1.26621]	0.340627 (0.88827) [0.38347]	0.246710 (0.75064) [0.32867]
R-squared	0.603457	0.671478	0.602915	0.657197	0.405068
Adj. R-squared	0.239960	0.370333	0.238920	0.342960	-0.140286
Sum sq. resids	60.10427	4.02E+18	120.0605	18.53991	13.23971
S.E. equation	2.238010	5.79E+08	3.163074	1.242977	1.050385
F-statistic	1.660143	2.229747	1.656383	2.091409	0.742762
Log likelihood	-45.07085	-509.9665	-53.37382	-30.95698	-26.91653
Akaike AIC	4.755904	43.49721	5.447819	3.579749	3.243044
Schwarz SC	5.344931	44.08624	6.036846	4.168776	3.832071
Mean dependent	-0.093743	-7975953.	0.432280	-0.142047	1.036250
S.D. dependent	2.567106	7.29E+08	3.625720	1.533442	0.983653
Determinant resid covariance (dof adj.)		2.34E+18			
Determinant resid covariance		7.32E+16			
Log likelihood		-636.2574			
Akaike information criterion		58.43812			
Schwarz criterion		61.62868			

In Table-1 the first column provides the list of variables. Table-1 indicates that the number of theoretically compatible and satisfactory results in terms of signs and size of coefficients exceed that of incompatible results. The adjusted R2 values are also reasonably high. More specifically, the adjusted R2 values are 0.60, 0.61, 0.67 and 0.41 respectively for the four equations. The problem of auto-correlation, where detected in the model through the Durbin Watson test, was removed by applying auto regressive scheme two, AR (2).5

V. Conclusion and Policy Implication

While trade liberalization is regarded as encouraging development by affecting development indicators in a desirable manner, it has not influenced the chosen indicators of poverty, income distribution, PGDP and employment in Pakistan as expected during the period of study. It affected employment positively but PGDP negatively in the country. Increased imports, availability of cheap raw material and machinery under conditions of unrestricted trade on the one hand enhances production, while exports of manufactured goods on the other hand, led to the creation of additional employment opportunities in the country due mainly to increase in demand for domestic goods. The reason behind trade liberalization affecting PGDP adversely may be that although imported products are expected to be cheaper than local products, it has not been the case for Pakistan. Imported products served as one of the factors which increased the prices of local goods with adverse effects on their demand and production and thereby on PGDP.

The study has the following policy implications.

- Since Pakistan is a labor abundant country, it should give priority to the production and export of labor-intensive products, such as textiles.
- For poverty alleviation the productivity-oriented approaches, with the potential to increase the income of the poor by increasing their productivity, should be encouraged.
- Political stability which is one of the most effective factors of development should be promoted in the country. Improved political stability has favorable implications. In the last fifty years Pakistan has faced several changes in government and consequently changes in economic policies. To improve economic performance, the country should improve political stability.
- Pakistan should improve the performance of its mediating factors for trade liberalization to be effective in promoting growth and development.

References

- Abbas, Q., 2001, "Endogenous Growth and Human Capital: A Comparative study of Pakistan and Sri Lanka", *Pakistan Development Review*, 40:4, 987-1007.
- Behrman, J. and Srinivasan T.N., 1995, "HandBook of Development Economics"; Elsevier Science: The Netherlands.
- Chenery, H. and Srinivasan T.N., 1989, "HandBook of Development Economics"; Elsevier Science: The Netherlands.
- Edwards, S., 1993, "Openness, Trade Liberalisation, and Growth in Developing Countries", *Journal of Economic Literature*, 31:3. 1358-1393
- Mahbub ul Haq Human Development Centre, 2003, "Human Development in South Asia 2003", Oxford University Press, Islamabad.
- Govt. of Pakistan, 2003, *Economic Survey*, (Various Issues) FBS, Islamabad.
- Govt. of Pakistan, 2003, Trade policies (Various Issues), Ministry of Commerce, Islamabad.
- Greenway, D., M., Wyn. and Wright, P., 2002, "Trade Liberalisation and Economic Growth in Developing Countries", *Journal of Development Economics*, 67:1. 229-244.
- Hunt, D., 1989, "Economic Theories of Development: An analysis of competing paradigm", Harvester Wheatsheaf: USA.
- Irwin, A. Douglas and Tervio, M., 2002, "Does trade raise income? Evidence from the twentieth century", *Journal of Development Economics*, 58:1.1-18.
- Kemal, A.R., Din, Musleh-ud., and Qadir, U., 2002, "Global research Project: Pakistan Country Report on Sources of Economic Growth", Pakistan Institute of Development Economics: Islamabad.
- Mohsin, M. H., Kemal, A. M., and Qadir, U., 2001, "Impact of Trade Reforms on Poverty", Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Sixteenth Annual General Meeting: Islamabad.
- Wacziarg, R., 1998, "Measuring the dynamic gains from trade", World Bank Policy Research Working Papers 2001. *Trade Liberalization and Economic Development: Evidence from Pakistan 35*
- Yang, Y. and Haung Y., 1997, "Impact of Trade Liberalisation on Income Distribution in China". Economic Division Working Papers No. 1.SS