Community Leaders Boise, Idaho For delivery September 7, 1995 12:30 PM MDT

- A Perspective on the Twelfth District and U.S. Economies
- I. Good afternoon. It's a pleasure to be here.
  - A. Recently, the U.S. economy and monetary policy have changed course.
- 1. Economic activity slowed substantially this year, after three years of rapid growth.
- 2. And in early July, the Fed cut its key policy tool\_the federal funds rate\_by one-quarter percentage point,
- a. reversing the pattern of interest rate increases it had undertaken in 1994 and early 1995.
- B. Today I'd like to give you my perspective on these developments and their consequences for both the Twelfth District and the nation.
  - 1. I believe these developments are interrelated\_
- 2. \_indeed, I see them as part of a consistent monetary policy regime designed to aim at price stability.
- II. Let me start with Idaho.
- A. Not so long ago, Idaho was vying with Utah for the country's Number One ranking in payroll employment growth.
  - 1. But the recent slowdown here has been quite pronounced,
    - a. and Idaho now ranks 24th.
- 2. While jobs in the electronics sector continue to expand here, weakness is felt in many other sectors,
- a. with outright declines in key areas like construction and manufacturing in recent months.
- B. This kind of dropoff goes beyond what we might expect if Idaho were simply tracking the nation's performance.
- 1. One likely explanation is that the state's economy is making an adjustment from the unsustainably high growth rates in recent years.
  - a. These high growth rates were fueled in part by migration into Idaho.
- b. Now, the unemployment statistics suggest the net in-migration is tapering off.
- c. That is, despite slower employment growth, the state's labor market remains relatively tight.
  - 2. Another explanation relates to the state economy's traditional resource base.
- a. For example, data on manufacturers statewide as well as in the Boise area show recent employment declines in the lumber and wood products sector.

better.

- 1. In fact, Utah, Nevada, and Arizona rank first, second, and third in employment growth,
  - 2. while Oregon ranks a strong sixth, and Washington comes in at twelfth.
  - D. Hawaii, Alaska, and California aren't faring as well, however.
    - 1. Hawaii's job market has been in a slump for almost three years,
    - 2. and job growth in Alaska's natural resource sector also has been weak.
- E. When we turn to California, though, it looks like we're getting a moderate recovery.
  - 1. Some of the weak sectors are balanced by several fast-growing ones\_
    - a. \_such as high tech, business services, entertainment, and tourism.
- 2. As a result, the recovery in California actually has picked up momentum this year,
  - a. and the consensus forecast is for further improvement in 1996.
  - F. A stronger California has implications for other western states.
- 1. On the plus side, it should mean more demand for goods and services produced in the other states.
- a. Our research in this area indicates that, in the past, California was a "driver" of the west,
- $\,$  b. though more so for the bordering states than for more distant ones like Idaho.
- 2. On the other hand, a relatively stronger California economy means that Californians are less likely to move to other states.
- a. This is significant since the recent net migration from California helped satisfy the demand for workers in several western states.
- III. Now let me turn to the national economic picture. First I'll give you a little background on the Fed's thinking about the economy over the last year and a half, and then I'll give you my views on the outlook.
  - A. The Fed became concerned about rising inflationary pressures last year.
    - 1. In 1992, 1993, and 1994, the economy grew rapidly,
      - a. averaging between 3 and 4 percent growth rates\_
      - b. well above the 2 to 3 percent long-run potential rate.
- 2. This long stretch of rapid growth ultimately pushed goods and labor markets to operate beyond their long-run capacities.
- a. For example, signs of strain showed up in manufacturing capacity utilization rates.
  - b. And the unemployment rate fell to just under 5% percent,

- (1) which appeared to be somewhat below the rate that can be sustained without rising inflation.
- 3. So, based on these indicators, the overall picture suggested that we had overshot capacity.
  - B. As a result, inflation would have been on the rise in the future\_
    - 1. unless the economy had slowed down.
- 2. That's why we raised short-term interest rates from February 1994 to February 1995.
- C. Since the beginning of this year, the pace of economic activity has cooled, and the timing of the slowdown has followed the normal lags between a policy action and economic activity.
  - 1. The first quarter numbers showed substantially slower growth\_
    - a. from a 5 percent pace at the end of 1994 to 2® percent.
  - 2. In the second quarter, the numbers showed an even greater slowdown\_
    - a. to a meager 1.1 percent.
  - D. As a result of this slowing in the economy, inflationary pressures receded a bit.
- 1. In fact, they receded enough that we felt a modest reduction in short-term interest rates was warranted.
  - 2. That's what led to our ¼ percentage point cut in the funds rate in July.
- IV. Looking ahead, I'm optimistic that we'll have a fairly quick return to the kind of moderate, sustainable growth that the economy needs.
- A. For one thing, the second quarter GDP figures weren't as weak as they appeared on the surface.
- 1. Most of the weakness occurred in inventory investment, as firms made progress in working off excess stocks.
  - 2. But it now appears that inventories are in better balance with sales,
    - a. so a good deal of this depressing factor appears to be behind us.
- 3. In addition, the demand of households and firms for goods and services held up quite well in the second quarter,
  - a. growing at a modest and sustainable 2½ percent rate.
- B. It looks as if demand probably will continue to hold up, although there are some pluses and minuses.
  - 1. On the minus side,
    - a. government spending will continue to contract moderately.
- b. While there's good reason to believe that less government spending and lower federal budget deficits will be good for the economy in the long run,
  - c. in the short run, this contraction dampens demand.

- a. prospects for growth among most of our major trading partners appear reasonably good, so that foreign purchases of our exports should bolster growth in this country.
  - b. In addition, I expect to see continuing strength in business investment.
- (1) For example, spending on computers is likely to continue the remarkable upward trend it has followed for the last several years.
- c. Finally, various financial factors\_such as the strength in the stock market and recent declines in long-term interest rates\_should help boost the economy.
- (1) In fact, I expect the lower long-term rates to contribute to a reasonably good performance next year for the housing sector.
- V. Now, so far,
  - A. I've described
    - 1. the Fed's concerns,
    - 2. its course of action,
      - 3. and the effects on the economy.
  - B. What I'd like to do in closing is to tie this together;
- 1. I'd like to show you how these actions and outcomes are consistent with a set of goals and procedures the Fed has adhered to for quite some time now.
  - C. The goal, of course, is to deliver stable prices.
    - 1. There's a good reason we focus on price stability:
- a. it's the main way monetary policy can promote the maximum sustainable advance in the country's economic output and the people's standard of living.
  - 2. This isn't just a theoretical matter.
  - 3. For one thing, we're not the only central bank with that focus.
- a. In the 1980s, a number of countries\_both developed and developing\_shifted their emphasis to reducing inflation.
  - (1) Let me just rattle off a short list:
- $\,$  (2) There's Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Sweden, the United Kingdom, France, and Argentina.
  - b. Of course, Germany and Japan have had this emphasis for a lot longer.
- ${\tt D.}$  For another, here in the U.S., we learned about the need for price stability from hard experience:
  - 1. In the 1970s, when inflation rose to double digits,
    - a. we had economic and financial instability,
    - b. and ultimately a big, double-dip recession in the early 1980s.

same policy regime:

- 1. While being responsive to cyclical ups downs in the economy, we're also seeking to lower inflation gradually.
  - 2. And the emphasis is on gradual change,
- a. because we want monetary policy to have the smallest possible adverse effect on economic activity during the transition.
- F. Both the interest rate increases from 1994 to early this year\_as well as the recent cut in rates were in keeping with this policy regime.
  - 1. As I said, we raised rates when it became apparent
    - a. that the economy had overshot capacity
    - b. and that inflation would be on the rise unless the economy slowed.
- 2. Well, it did slow, and therefore inflationary pressures receded enough to warrant a modest reduction in rates.
  - G. Now, pursuing this policy isn't a straightforward, mechanical proposition.
- 1. It calls for frequent reassessments and readjustments, as economic conditions develop.
  - 2. But there is a constant in this policy regime that you can count on.
  - 3. And that's the policy goal
- a.  $\_$ providing the maximum sustainable economic growth through fostering price stability.