A Half-Century of Stagnation: Labour Productivity in Ontario's Gold Mining Industry

Karl Skogstad and Robert J. Petrunia

Lakehead University

Canadian Economics Association June 2017

Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

Gold Mine Productivity

CEA, 2017 1 / 30

Objective

What caused the large swings in labour productivity observed in Ontario's gold mining sector between 1920 and 1970?

To answer this we complete the following tasks:

- Create a unique mine-level data set which has production, financial, and employment data on Ontario's gold mines.
- Identify important events/policies which caused disruption to the industry.
- Decompose changes in aggregate productivity à la Foster, Haltiwanger, and Krizan (2001) (**FHK**).

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

Aggregate Labour Productivity (ounces of gold per worker)



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

CEA, 2017 3 / 30

Data

Data

Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

Gold Mine Productivity

CEA, 2017 4 / 30

Data

Data Sources

- Source: Annual Reports of the Ontario Department of Mines.
- Two components Aggregated industry statistics & individual mine-level reports.
- Aggregated industry statistics:
 - 189 gold mines.
 - Limited data ounces produced, tons milled, and value of output.
- Mine-level data:
 - 76 gold mines producing 91.5% of total output.
 - More complete data financial, production, labour, exploration & development, reserves, and capital.

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日





Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

CEA, 2017 6 / 30

Trends in Productivity

Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

Gold Mine Productivity

э CEA, 2017 7 / 30

-

・ロッ ・ 一 ・ ・ ・ ・

Aggregate Labour Productivity (ounces of gold per worker)



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

CEA, 2017 8 / 30

Aggregate Labour Productivity (tons of ore per worker)



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

CEA, 2017 9 / 30

Aggregate Labour Productivity (revenue per worker)



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

CEA, 2017 10 / 30

Trends in Productivity



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

æ CEA, 2017 11 / 30

Price of Gold



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

CEA, 2017 12 / 30

- ₹ 🖬 🕨

Trends in Productivity



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

æ CEA, 2017 13 / 30

★ E ► ★ E ►

P

Number of Operating Mines



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

CEA, 2017 14 / 30

Trends in Productivity



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

Gold Mine Productivity

CEA, 2017 15 / 30

Decomposition

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

FHK Decomposition

$$\Delta P_{t} = \sum_{e \in C} s_{et-1} \Delta p_{et} + \sum_{e \in C} (p_{et-1} - P_{t-1}) \Delta s_{et} + \sum_{e \in C} \Delta p_{et} \Delta s_{et} + \sum_{e \in N} s_{et} (p_{et} - P_{t-1}) - \sum_{e \in X} s_{et-1} (p_{et-1} - P_{t-1})$$
(1)

- The first term is the **within** component which indicates how the productivity at continuing mines is changing.
- The second term is the **between** component which indicates how the share of aggregate labour of continuing mines is changing.
- The third term is the **cross** of these two terms.
- The fourth term is the **entry** component.
- The fifth term is the **exit** component.

(*) *) *) *)

Decomposition

1933-1938



Average Ore Grade (ounces per ton)



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

Gold Mine Productivity

CEA, 2017 19 / 30

Productivity		Shares				
Measure	Total	Within	Between	Cross	Entry	Exit
Ounces	-79	0.83	0.03	-0.29	0.52	-0.10
Tons	-85	0.45	0.29	-0.11	0.63	-0.27
Revenue	\$808	1.50	-0.06	-0.45	-0.19	0.21

◆ロ > ◆母 > ◆臣 > ◆臣 > ○ 臣 ○ のへで



Aggregate Employment



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

Gold Mine Productivity

CEA, 2017 22 / 30

Productivity		Shares				
Measure	Total	Within	Between	Cross	Entry	Exit
Ounces	-31	1.02	0.37	-0.24	0.14	-0.29
Tons	-6	4.94	4.49	-6.72	0.12	-1.83
Revenue	-\$888	1.05	0.46	-0.30	0.15	-0.36

◆ロ > ◆母 > ◆臣 > ◆臣 > ○ 臣 ○ のへで



Average Ounces of Gold Produced per Mine



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

CEA, 2017 25 / 30

Productivity		Shares				
Measure	Total	Within	Between	Cross	Entry	Exit
Ounces	86	0.48	0.15	0.10	0.17	0.10
Tons	300	0.64	0.22	0.02	0.10	0.01
Revenue	\$2,675	0.44	0.17	0.09	0.18	0.12
Adj. Revenue	\$3,083	0.49	0.15	0.08	0.17	0.11

Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

► ▲ Ē ► Ē ∽ ९ ୯ CEA, 2017 26 / 30

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・



Average Yearly Wage



Skogstad & Petrunia (Lakehead)

Gold Mine Productivity

CEA, 2017 28 / 30

Productivity		Shares				
Measure	Total	Within	Between	Cross	Entry	Exit
Ounces	32	-0.43	0.55	0.07	0.17	0.63
Tons	35	-2.13	1.46	-0.90	0.73	1.85
Revenue	\$1,705	-0.15	0.35	0.23	0.15	0.40
Adj. Revenue	\$3,000	0.10	0.19	0.35	0.15	0.21

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・

Conclusion

- The cause of the dip in productivity in the early 1930s was caused by existing mines pursuing lower grade portions of their ore bodies and by the entrance of small, relatively unproductive mines.
- It is likely that the recovery in productivity would have occurred sooner, were it not for the Second World War.
- Strong post-war productivity recovery was driven by scale effects and re-capitalization, but was only possible thanks to the EGMAA.
- If factors such as grade and scale are accounted for, then there were in fact some labor productivity gains throughout this period.
- Going forward we plan to make use of our mine-level data to better understand the relationship between, these factors and labour productivity.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト