經原一 作業一解答

一、選擇題

1. A	2. D	3. B	4. B	5. A
6. A	7. D	8. A	9. B	10. C
11. C	12.D	13. B	14. D	15. A

二、問答題

1.

- (1) One possibility would be to compensate women only for the second or third child they have. Ideally we would like to know how many children the woman expects to have anyway and give a financial compensation for any child above this level. As this information is impossible to collect, compensation above the average number of children per family may be an alternative. That said, we may in this case be compensating women who would have lots of children anyway, and it is not clear that these are the women we want to target.
- (2) One way of learning whether the incentive scheme is encouraging more births rather than just earlier births is to wait and see what happens to the birthrate over time. If it continues to increase, then the program encouraged more births, but if the birthrate falls back to previous levels, then the program only affected the timing of births.

2.

- a. Canada has the comparative advantage in making boots. Canada's opportunity cost of making one boot is giving up one shirt. In the United States, the opportunity cost of making one boot is giving up three shirts. The United States has the comparative advantage in making shirts. In the United States, the opportunity cost of making one shirt is giving up one-third of a boot, but Canada's opportunity cost of making one shirt is one boot.
- b. Neither country has an absolute advantage in making both goods. The United States has the absolute advantage in shirts, but Canada has the absolute advantage in boots. Remember, both countries have the same amount of resources. If each country puts all their resources into shirts, then the U.S. makes 12 shirts, but Canada makes only 6 shirts. If each country puts all their resources into boots, then Canada makes 6 boots, but the United States makes only 4 boots.
- c. If both countries specialize in the good in which they have a comparative advantage and then trade with the other, they can both be better off. Let's use the case in which each trades half of what it makes for half of what the other makes. The United States will specialize by making 12 shirts and Canada will specialize by making 6 boots. Since each gets half of the other's production, they both end up with 6 shirts and 3 boots. This means they are better off than before trading, because they end up with the same amount of boots, but twice as many shirts. Other trades will also make them better off.