Local Labor Markets in Canada and the United States*

David Albouy[†1] Chandler Lutz[2] Casey Warman[3]

[1]University of Illinois and NBER
[2]Copenhagen Business School
[3]Dalhousie University and NBER

October 18, 2016

Abstract

This paper examines and compares local labour market in the United States and Canada. Employment varies more in Canada, while wages and skill levels vary less, suggesting weaker agglomeration economies and skill sorting. Majority non-English communities (Francophone and Hispanophone) in each country display distinct wage levels, skills, and inequality. We also examine patterns in labor market institutions and skill prices. Shifts in labor demand have much weaker effects on employment and wages in Canada, although greater effects on unemployment. We find no conclusive evidence of differential effects of immigration.

JEL classification: J21, J31, J61, R12, N32

Keywords: Labor demand, wage structure, regional economies, mobility, immigration

*We appreciate helpful feedback from David Card, Brian Kovak, Peter Kuhn, Ethan Lewis, and Lance Lochner. The Canadian analysis presented in this paper was mainly conducted at the Atlantic Research Data Centre, which is part of the Canadian Research Data Centre Network (CRDCN). The services and activities provided by the Atlantic Research Data Centre are made possible by the financial or in-kind support of the SSHRC, the CIHR, the CFI, Statistics Canada and Dalhousie University. The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily represent the CRDCN or those of its partners. We are also grateful to RDC analyst Heather Hobson for her assistance, as well as Lachlan MacLeod. All errors are our own.

[†]Corresponding author. Department of Economics, University of Illinois, 216 David Kinley Hall, 1407 W. Gregory Dr., Urbana, IL 61801. Email: albouy@illinois.edu

1 Introduction

Local labor markets in Canada in the United States share not only a continent and a common border, but also an exciting new possibilities for research. As Moretti (2011) points out, understanding local labor markets is fundamental for understanding aggregate changes, casts light on important policy questions, and deepens understanding of market equilibria. No other country appears to share a system of metropolitan areas quite so similar to the U.S., as Canada, and much stands to be gained from understanding how its local conditions differ, and how their responses to changes diverge. Canada should naturally look to the United States for comparison. With a few important differences, comparisons of the U.S. and Canada are predicated on many of the same principles as comparisons across local labor markets.

Below, we consider how the structure of employment and wages differ between the U.S. and Canada and how these patterns changed in common or different ways since 1980.

Among OECD countries, the United States and Canada are the only two that share such an expansive territory, over 5000 kilometers coast-to-coast, a similar history of settlement, and a resource-intensive yet modern economy. While Canada's economy is decidedly smaller, the financial firms of Bay Street and Wall Street, the oil fields of Alberta and Alaska, and the auto manufacturers of Windsor and Detroit, not only resemble each other, but share strong economic and geographic ties. While trade is relatively free between the two countries, labour mobility between the two is still heavily restricted by immigration laws, particularly for low-skilled workers. Therefore, both can be largely seen as separate, if co-dependent labor markets.

While many features distinguish U.S. and Canadian labour markets, we focus on those that may have the greatest local impact. First, both countries have a substantial non-English population that form the majority of several cities. 20 percent of Canadian workers report using French as their primary language of work, with a similar percentage of all Canadians using French at home. These Francophones are found primarily in the province of Quebec (Canada (2013)). In the United States, 13 percent use Spanish at home, although over half of them claim proficiency in English. These populations are less geographically concentrated, but do make up a majority of an important number of metro areas, particularly along the Mexican border, such as Laredo, McAllen and El Paso.[1]. We expect the linguistic divide

[1]There do not seem to be data sources on the language of work in the United States

between Quebec and the rest of Canada to slow the mobility of workers in and out of these areas. In a sense, these linguistically separate areas offer a second environment within each country for considering small differences that matter.[2]

Second, both countries are politically independent and have distinct labor market policies and institutions, that vary geographically. While both countries have higher levels of unionization along their traditional manufacturing belt, Canada's union coverage has been more resilient, possibly as it has been more difficult for employers to escape protective laws without crossing an international border — unlike the case of "Right to Work" states (Holmes (1998)). Canada, has also traditionally supported more generous unemployment insurance schemes, while the U.S. in the past, had a more geographically binding minimum wage. Canada also has high levels of unemployment insurance, as well as large intergovernmental transfers, which are likely to reduce mobility to most areas with greater labor-market opportunities (Albouy (2012))

Third, both the U.S. and Canada have seen similar yet different shifts in their industrial make up, impacting different parts of their economy. Canada was slightly less reliant on manufacturing in 1980, and saw a smaller disruption to its manufacturing belt. It does has seen its relatively larger share of jobs in oil, gas, and other natural resources, rise relative to the U.S., which has been more subject to to booms and busts. Atlantic Canada is also heavily reliant on wild fishing, which saw a massive disruption when certain fish stocks disappeared in the early 1990s. The housing boom also never seems to have ended in Canada, which given the experience in the U.S., (Hurst et al. (2016)) should benefit low-skilled workers.

Fourth, Canada's population is even more heavily immigrant than the United States', with 21 as opposed to 13 percent foreign born. Because of its skill-oriented immigration policy, Canada tends to attract immigrants from different source countries, particularly from Asia. (Borjas (1993)) These immigrants are more attracted to the Pacific Coast and its urban centers. These differ from the largely Latin American immigrants who come to the U.S., who tend to locate in metros of different sizes, as well as rural areas, mainly from California to Texas. The dissimilarities in source countries and skill mix seem to have led to immigrants having a different impact on wages, compressing wages in Canada while causing more wage

[2] Albouy (2008) provides an important analysis comparing the changing labor market fortunes of Anglophones and Francophones in Quebec relative to the rest of Canada since 1970, arguing that Quebec has transitioned to a largely Francophone economy by the year 2000.

inequality in the U.S. (Aydemir and Borjas (2007)).

Below, we examine U.S. and Canadian labor markets and how they have changed since 1980. Our analysis begins with a largely descriptive account. This is key, as there are not any analyses of Canadian local labor markets that match the depth of those in the United States. This may have something to do with the more limited geo-coding available in public-use files, which we overcome using restricted-access Canadian data.

Along most dimensions, there is much more heterogeneity across labor markets within each country than there is both countries. This is true for important outcomes such as regionally persistent differences in unemployment rates and the wage earn by university relative to high-school graduates. For example, if we were to cut Canada along the Ottawa River, or separate U.S. cities with ocean coasts from those without, we would find differences as large or larger than across the U.S. Canada border. Our linguistic enclaves also show similar differences. *Check :)*

While many early analyses — see the collection in Card and Freeman (1993) — that focus on inequality and institutions have found evidence of the U.S. and Canada diverging since 1980, we find certain patterns that suggest the countries exhibiting similar patterns. For example, urban-rural differences in wages and inequality were much less apparent in Canada than they were in the U.S.; while differences remain, they are much more apparent today.

We also provide a detailed analysis of labor-market institutions across metro areas. Unionization levels vary considerably within states and provinces, making these poor substitutes for more disaggregated measures. Unionization appears to be especially strong in many of Canada's smaller cities, although even its larger cities generally now surpass the most unionized cities in the U.S.. A comparison of minimum wage levels with prevailing wage levels at the lower percentiles, implies that a majority of U.S. local labor markets were seriously affected by minimum wages, supporting the work of Lee (1999). These places have largely disappeared, though they have become slightly more common in Canada. Lastly we consider the distribution of welfare and unemployment insurance benefits to various metro areas, to highlight its responsiveness to local conditions, as well as more generous treatment of certain areas by the central government.

The analysis concludes with a classic exercise that considers how metro areas in the U.S.

and Canada respond to changes in local labor demand shifts predicted by national industrial shifts, following the popular Bartik (1991) analysis, which has never been tried for Canada.[3] Our results suggest that local wages and employment are much less responsive than in the U.S. At the same time long-term unemployment rates are much more impacted in Canada, which may result from its employment insurance system.

We also consider how immigration affects U.S. and Canadian labor markets following the methodologies laid out by Card (2001) and Basso and Peri (2015). Although the methodology is successful in predicting immigration, we do not find large impacts. (More to be done)

2 Data

2.1 Cross-Sectional Samples

We draw most of our analysis from geographically detailed Census data. For the United States, public-use geographic identifiers are generally adequate for defining metro areas.[4] However, for Canada, more detail is drawn from the restricted use Census files. For the U.S. we use the the 1980, 1990 and 2000 Census data and the 2005-2007 ACS data, while for Canada, we use the 1981, 1991, 2001 and 2006 Canadian Master file Census data.

To examine the idiosyncrasies of metro areas with non-English majorities, we create a variables to include those in Quebec or in Hispanophone communities.[5]

Our sample contains 276 metro areas in the U.S. — using 1999 OMB Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas – and 32 in Canada – Census Metropolitan Areas defined by the Census. All of these areas have a minimum population of 50,000 inhabitants, making them roughly comparable. Toronto is the largest metro area in Canada. In 1980 it had 2.9 million inhabitants, behind Boston, Detroit, Philadelphia, San Francisco-San Jose, Washington-Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York. It has since surpassed Detroit, been surpassed by Dallas, and is roughly tied with Boston. Together these metropolitan areas account for about three quarters of the population in each country. [6]

[3] See also Bound and Holzer (2000), Autor and Duggan (n.d.), Moretti (2004), and Moretti (2013)

[4] In a small number of cases we use a probabilistic matching system based on the overlap between Public Use Microdata Areas and metropolitan areas. These areas are defined using 1999 Office of Management and Budget definitions. Large metro areas use the Consolidated Metropolitan classification, so that Oakland is joined to San Francisco, and Stamford to New York.

[5] Our Francophone communities consists of Montréal, Québec, Sherbrooke, Chicoutimi-Jonquiére and Trois-Riviéres. Our Hispanophone communities are El Paso, McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, Laredo, TX; Salinas, Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA; Las Cruces, NM; Yuma, AZ

[6] A small problem with comparing CMAs to CMSAs, is that the latter are somewhat broader in land area as they are formed out of counties, which can be quite large, except for New England. CMAs are formed from municipalities (Census subdivisions) Our restricted-access Canadian data could allow us to consider smaller

Difficulties with the 2011 National Household Survey have precluded us from examining changes since the Great Recession (this may change).

Construction of weekly and hourly wage series are hampered by differences in how weekly hours are reported in Canada, which apply only to a reference week, while the U.S. asks for typical hours. For that reason, we generally focus on comparisons of weekly wages, except for when we consider differences in the hourly minimum wage.

There are also some challenges in classifying education. While the U.S., has a standardized four years of high school and university each, Canada has a system that varies more by province. We group education into five groups based on the highest level of education of achieved: less than high school, high school, post secondary below a bachelor's degree, and a graduate degree.

2.2 Wage Differentials across Metropolitan Areas

Wages differences across metropolitan areas may be decomposed according to those explained by observed location-invariant, worker characteristics, and what is explained, at least statistically, by metropolitan location. Using the logarithm of weekly wages w_{ijt}^k for worker i in city j in year t in country k, fit a Minceran regression of the form

$$w_{ijt}^k = X_{ijt}^k \beta_t^k + \mu_{jt}^k + \varepsilon_{ijt}^k \tag{1}$$

where X_{it}^k are location invariant characteristics of the worker, whose returns β_t^k vary by country and year. The "fixed effects" μ_{jt}^k are coefficients on indicator variables for each city in each time period. With an orthogonal error term ε_{ijt}^k, the μ_{jt}^k should represent the average effect of location j on the wages of a typical worker.[7] Despite the tremendous potential for confounding unobservables, the overall pattern of wages across U.S. and Canadian cities appear consistent with one of spatial equilibrium. On the whole, wage levels — controlling for differences in observed worker characteristics — appear to largely compensate workers for differences in amenities as well as costs-of-living (Albouy et al. (2013), Albouy (2016)). It seems reasonable to conclude that these wage differences express how the price of labor varies across areas, and not just differences in worker quality.

Census Agglomerations, but we do not have similar restricted-access U.S. data.

[7] We later consider how the coefficient may differ across worker types, indicating a measure of comparative advantage across locations.

Taking the expectation of wages by year and metro area allows us to express the average of log wages at the metro level as the sum of a skill index and a location index

$$E_i[w_{ijt}^k] = \underbrace{\bar{w}_{jt}^k}_{\text{metro wage}} = \underbrace{\bar{X}_{jt}^k \beta_t^k}_{\text{skill index}} + \underbrace{\mu_{jt}^k}_{\text{location index}} \tag{2}$$

where $\bar{X}_{jt} = E_i[X_{ijt}]$ denotes the average characteristics, and $E_i[\varepsilon_{ijt}^k] = 0$. Overall wage changes by metro area across time may then also be decomposed as changes in the the skill index versus changes in the location index.

In addition we consider measures related to educational attainments based on University (Bachelors Only) and High School (12 years in the U.S. and 11 or 12 in Canada) equivalents. Following Katz and Murphy (1992), the wage measure depends only on the ratio of these two distinct groups. The supply measure adds workers with less than a high-school degree to high school, those with more than a Bachelors to University, and divides those in-between with 2/3 to high school and 1/3 to university.[8]

2.3 Growth and Divergence

Following the literature on growth — see Barro et al. (1991) and Coulombe and Lee (1995) for analyses of inter-state growth in the U.S. and inter-provincial growth in Canada — we consider two different measures of whether areas become closer and further apart.

If we consider measures of overall dispersion, say as given by the standard deviation, we may consider areas to be converging if overall dispersion across areas falls. This concept is referred to as σ-convergence. Thus we may consider whether

$$\frac{\sigma_t}{\sigma_0} < 1. \tag{3}$$

for standard deviations, σ_t in the current period, and a base period $t = 0$. Next, we can consider if areas that are ahead are likely to see their advantage grow, or to mean revert, which is known as β convergence. This latter concept is more related to concepts around labor mobility. Rather than apply it to growth rates, we simply consider whether for a given

[8] Our regressions below suggest that this is relatively correct, although the in-between "some-college' group may in fact be closer to high-school for Canadians.

outcome, with drift ξ_t, we see

$$x_t = \zeta_t + \beta_t x_0, \quad \beta_t < 1. \tag{4}$$

Thus, it is possible for overall dispersion to increase, i.e., σ diverge, even while areas grow together, i.e., β converge.

3 Patterns of Local Labor Markets in the U.S. and Canada

In the following section, we consider how wage rates, employment, skills, and inequality vary across local labor markets, as defined by metropolitan areas. Table 2 examines how these patterns vary with the population of metropolitan areas, as we consider how larger markets may improve labor productivity through agglomeration benefits such as from reduced search friction, better matching and human capital accumulation Baum-Snow and Pavan (2013). It takes the United States as a base case, with and considers a possible interaction with Canada. It accounts for the linguistically separate markets with an indicator for Quebec and Hispanophone communities.

3.1 Unemployment and Employment

According to our numbers in Figure 1, both the U.S. and Canada have considerable regional unemployment, which appears to have persisted for 25 years. In the U.S. we see rust-belt cities, such as Detroit and Benton Harbor, with declining manufacturing experiencing the highest levels of unemployment in both 1980 and 2010. Hispanophone communities also appear to suffer disproportionately. University cities, such as Columbia, Charlottesville, and Iowa City have rates that are persistently low.

In Canada, unemployment has been persistently higher in the Atlantic areas, particularly in non-metro areas of Newfoundland, which also has the lowest labor-force attachment at both the beginning and end of our sample. Unemployment is also very high in much of Quebec outside Montreal and Windsor (perhaps collateral damage from Detroit), while the rest of Canada is close to the U.S. mean, except for Calgary, which is especially low.

During the time when overall unemployment rates diverged between the U.S. and Canada, overall, the dispersion in local unemployment rates shrunk in the U.S., while it grew in Canada, from being over 50 percent greater in 1980 and over 150 percent greater in 2006/7.

These unemployment patterns are largely mirrored in the employment-population ratio.

These numbers also show an upward trend that is due to women's growing role in the labor force, which has seen especially strong convergence in Canada relative to the U.S.

Looking to columns 2 and 3 of 2 we see that unemployment rates show a positive if insignificant relationship with population in the United States, while Canada this goes the other way. Over time, it appears that the unemployment gradient has become more positive, from what was once a clearly negative gradient in Canada. The unemployment penalty in Quebec has averaged roughly 2 points, but is diminishing over time. Meanwhile, Hispanophone communities have a slightly higher penalty, with no discernible trend.

3.2 Cross-Sectional Wage Differences

Column 1 of Table 2 displays how wages differ across metropolitan area according to population, expressed in logarithms. Across years in Panel A, the wage-population elasticity is 0.072 in the United States. In Canada, the gradient is lower by 3 points. The cross section makes it appear as though there are fewer gains from agglomeration in Canada than in the U.S. This gradient does seem to be growing over time in both countries. We also see a negative penalty for workers in French and Spanish linguistic enclaves. Furthermore, this gap appears to be growing over time.

The dynamics of the changing local wage structure are seen in the first row of 1 As far as our data can show, the wage varies roughly the same in the United States than in Canada, with respective log standard deviations of 0.13 in both years. Both countries exhibit signs of σ divergence, as these numbers were once smaller at 0.11 and 0.10, respectively.[9]

In terms of β convergence, the countries exhibit slightly different patterns, as seen in 1. In 1980 wage levels in the United States were at their highest in Alaska, Detroit, and Chicago, followed by smaller soon-to-be rust-belt cities such as Saginaw, which was tied with San Francisco. The latter along with New York, Washington, and most of the Pacific Coast and New England, as well as pockets of the Southeast, including cities in Southern Florida. In 1980, the highest-paying areas were large cities in Alberta and British Columbia, followed by Ontario, and a lesser extent Quebec. Since then, relative wages in Quebec fell considerably, as did those in British Columbia. Ontario has seen substantial gains, particularly around Kitchener, while more remote areas of the prairies have seen great gains.[10].

[9]The differences in the U.S. are greater after controlling for observable characteristics.
[10]For more, see Barro et al. (1991) and Coulombe and Lee (1995)

Interestingly these relationship hold even after we control for unobserved skills.

3.3 Educational Attainment and Skill Differentials

The United States and Canada also show differences in the skill distribution across metro areas. In the United States, differences in the predicted value of human capital have increased dramatically, exhibiting both σ and β divergence. Cities with the highest levels of human capital, such as Washington and Madison continued to outpace other cities, while cities particularly in the South began to lose. This includes many of the Hispanophone metros we observed today.[11] As measured by the relative supply index, we have seen an increase in σ dise

While Canada has also seen increases in the overall (σ) distribution of skills, the pattern of skill changes is noticeably different, with a tendency towards $\beta convergence$, as opposed to divergence. In particular, we see cities in Quebec, such as Montreal, exhibiting tremendous skill increases. As explained in Albouy (2008), this appears largely due to massive increases in the educational attainment of Francophones after extensive reforms undertaken during the "Quiet Revolution" of the 1960s. At the same time, relative wage levels in these cities dropped, as Montreal continued to lose its prominence relative to Toronto.

The inequality and wage differences are greater not just across workers in the U.S., but also across local labour markets. In general, the return to skills appears to be larger in the United States, which would generally make it advantageous for the skilled to emigrate from Canada, and the less skilled to immigrate. Card (2003). This would suggest that comparative advantage of moving across cities is larger for the skilled in Canada than for the unskilled labour.

3.4 Local Inequality and the Return to Skill

Nationally, levels of inequality since 1980 have grown considerably more in the United States than in Canada along most of the wage distribution. We can see this in figure 2. The return of a university degree relative to only a high-school degree rose from 33 log points (39 percent) in both countries in 1980 to 38 points (46%) in Canada to 55 points (73 %) in the U.S.

This gap shows considerable heterogeneity across metro areas, with a standard deviation

[11] It is worth noting, however, that increases in the distribution of skills has no discernible correlation with changes in the wage differentials across cities.

of XXX. On this gap appears to have risen across almost metro areas in the U.S, and independently of what it was in 1980. In Canada, went from high to higher in Calgary and in rural Newfoundland, rose substantially in Toronto, stayed average in Montreal and stagnated in British Columbia.

Overall inequality as measured by the 90-10 wage ratio appears to be at its highest in the non-metropolitan West. This is rather unlike the pattern in the United States where inequality has been predominantly high in large cities, such as San Francisco — as has been examined in Baum-Snow and Pavan (2013), who document how this is a phenomenon that is strengthening. The increasing grading of the Univ/HS and 90/10 gaps is seen to be increasing with city size in both columns 4 and 5 of table 2, at a growing rate.

In this context, it is surprising that inequality appears to have once been larger in smaller communities in Canada. However, the phenomenon shows signs of having largely reversed in recent years.

In addition we also find lower levels of inequality in Francophone Quebec, mirroring previous studies, based on Census data Albouy (2008) and tax records, Saez and Veall (2005). In contrast, Hispanophone communities exhibit higher levels of inequality, with a particularly high observed return to a university degree. The ultimate causes of this disparity — relative supply, differences in educational quality, or ethnic discrimination — could be a fruitful area for further study.

4 Institutional Measures at the Local Level

This section describes the institutions in the US and Canada that may impact the equilibrium price and quantity of labor. Given their similar heritage, we expect many of the differences to depend on their institutions. Importantly, we describe how the impact of the institutions, as far as we can quantify them, evolve over time throughout metro areas.

footnoteAccording to the OECD's Strictness of Employment Protection Index, the U.S. and Canada rank last and second to last, although in cardinal terms, Canada is closer to the rest of the Anglosphere, which is followed by Switzerland, Japan, and then the rest of Europe.

4.1 Unionization

(*Under Construction*) Unionization fell precipitously between

The same is not true in Canada, where Union coverage has stayed particularly high in

Quebec and Ontario outside of its two larges cities. [12] In the U.S. we see union coverage fall in almost all cities, with cities with highest levels losing the most (β convergence). Metros with the most resilient union coverage are largely state capitals, such as Albany and Springfield, reflecting U.S. public-sector unions.[13]

In Canada, unionization rates fell by much less, with some regional variation, such as cities in British Columbia seeing the highest drop.[14]

4.2 Minimum Wage

As detailed by DiNardo and Lemieux (1997), the U.S. minimum wage in appears to have greatly affected the lower part of the wage structure in the early 1980s, while in Canada the effect is much weaker. These roles reversed at the end of the 1980s when the Canadian minimum wage grew, while the U.S. minimum was gradually eroded by inflation. Since that time, minimum wage rates so a few large increases in the U.S., but were generally out-paced by Canadian increases.

Because of differences in wage levels locally, the impact on local wage structures is likely to be important. Note that the minimum wage is determined provincially in Canada; in the U.S. a common floor is set federally, while some states choose a higher minimum wage. Given that there is slightly more variation in wage levels within state than across them, this is far from a perfect adjustment mechanism.

To examine the degree to which minimum wages are binding at the lower part of the income distribution, figure 3 plots the ratio of hourly wages at the 10th percentile to the

[12] Current rates extrapolate from Hirsch and Macpherson (2004) from 1986 to 1980 using state unionization rates. **In Canada we currently extrapolate from 2006 to 1981 using provincial unionization rates due to delays in data access times.

[13] Many of the most unionized cities also saw a drop in their share of U.S. workers, contributing to the drop in national unionization rate.

[14] Starting in the 1960s, union membership fell in the US as the labor market shifted towards women and college graduates who are less likely to be union members.[15] The de-unionization trend accelerated after slow economic growth and several adverse economic shocks gave way to the so-called "Washington Consensus" in the late 1970s and 1980s (Levy and Temin, 2011). Researchers have estimated that this decline in unionization has accounted for about a third of the increase in the spread of the US income distribution and for 20 percent of the increase in the variance of log wages. Card (1992),Freeman (1993), andDiNardo et al. (1996). Lemieux (2008) provides an overview. In marked contrast, unionization rates in Canada ticked upwards in the 1970s before leveling off in the 1980s and dropping off in the 1990s. This divergence in union density has been studied by DiNardo and Lemieux (1997) and Freeman (1990), among others. While the US and Canada are closely integrated economies with similar views on unionization — Freeman (1990), Riddell (1993), Card and Freeman (1993), and DiNardo and Lemieux (1997) — small differences in labor laws are credited for cross-country differences in firms' pursuit of anti-union strategies. Indeed, Canadian labor laws limit firms' ability to fight unions by certifying unions after card checks, whereas so-called "union-prevention" technologies (e.g. union avoidance consultants) have flourished in the US where labor laws are more conducive to anti-union strategies (Logan, 2006). Freeman (1990) aptly summarizes these differences, noting that "...the same firms that go all out to defeat unions in the U.S. accept unionization of their Canadian plants."

minimum wage in each metro. Because imperfections in our measure of hourly wages, the a measure of below one may reflect data errors more than problem in enforcement.

In the U.S., the results appear rather dramatic for 1980. In most smaller metro areas and almost all non-metropolitan areas, the minimum wage appears to bind at the the 10th percentile. Yet by the year 2000, most communities have a 10th percentile far above the measured minimum wage at the state level. A key contributor to this change is declining federal minimum wage in the US: As shown in the appendix the real federal minimum wage fell during the 1980s and has since stagnated.

In Canada, the minimum wage appears to be much less binding in 1980. Figure 3 shows that the Canadian non-metro areas are likely to have a non-binding minimum wage, much like US non-metro areas. But in contrast to the US, the minimum wage binds in very few Canadian cities.

[16].

4.3 Transfers to Individuals and Local Governments

(*Under Construction*) The U.S. and Canada have distinct approaches to fiscal federalism. In most regards, Canada devolves more power to the provinces, while providing large transfers to provinces with low "fiscal capacity" through its equalization system. The U.S. has no explicit form of equalization outside of a few programs that operate at a smaller scale such as Empowerment Zones.Busso et al. (2013), and implicit transfers through higher matching rates to states with lower incomes in programs such as Medicaid. More important, fiscally, is that the uniform federal tax code implicitly penalizes workers for working in high-wage areas. Federal transfers only mildly reinforce this bias against high-wage areas, particularly large metros Albouy (2009). In Canada, by comparison, the penalty is generally enormous, with the typical dollar earned though migration is implicitly taxed at a rate of over 60 percent

[16]Figure A1 focuses more closely on institutional and labor market trends in the US and Canada. In these figures, the Canada is the solid line and the US is the dotted line. The plot in the top-left corner shows the trade union density, the portion of wage and salary workers that are union members, over time. The top-right plot shows the real the real federal minimum wage (2014 US$). Note that this measure does not take into local or state minimum wages. Before 1970, there was a large difference between the real minimum wage in the US and Canada. This spread closed in the early 1970s and the minimum wages in the US and Canadian closely tracked each other downwards until the late 1980s. Note that in the US case, that this steep decline in the real minimum wage is associated often with an increase in income inequality during the 1980s at the lower end of the distribution. See Lemieux (2008). Beginning in the 1990s, the spread between the two countries diverges again as the real minimum wage trends upwards in Canada but stagnates in the US. By the end of our sample, the real minimum wage in Canada was nearing its 1970s peak. Calculating the Canadian real minimum wage in Canadian dollars yields a similar pattern. See `http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-006-x/2014001/article/14035/c-g/desc/desc01-eng.htm`

Albouy (2012), with the exception of Alberta.

Our data on individuals allows us to consider direct payments received by individuals from governments both at the federal and sub-federal levels. In the U.S., unemployment insurance is handled by state governments. [17]

5 Structural changes in Demand and Supply

5.1 Industry Sector Shifts

Both the U.S. and Canada both have many major cities in the old "manufacturing belt." According to Krugman (1991) this belt corresponds to a parallelogram from Baltimore, west to St. Louis, north to Green Bay, and east to Maine, with the last border cutting into southern Ontario and Quebec. These areas are predicted to have suffered with the decline in manufacturing, most apparent in the early 1980s, and much of the 2000s. [18]

Both the United States and Canada contain substantial economic resources. However, with Canada's far greater ratio of land to people, it is not surprising that natural resources make up a greater portion of its economy. While natural resources are relatively dispersed much of the greatest value added from natural resources occur in the oil regions east of the Rockies, particularly in Alberta, as well along the Gulf Coast, Appalachia, northwestern Texas and Oklahoma.

In the Atlantic Provinces, fishing and related industries are the major employer. Fishing saw a major decline in the early 1990s as groundfish stocks, such as cod, were largely depleted, cutting the number of jobs by roughly half. In the United States, fishing is concentrated in New England and Alaska, and to a lesser extent, California, Washington and Florida, all of

[17] The second set of plots in figure A1 show that unemployment insurance and unemployment duration have traditionally been higher in Canada than in the US. This was especially true in the up until the late 1990s when Canadian unemployment benefits fell precipitously after a series government cuts.See for example Battle (1998). Further, at the end of the end of the sample unemployment benefits jumped in the US as American policy makers sought to offset the effects of the Great Recession. The left-hand plot in the third set of figures shows Canadians unemployment durations were substantially higher in Canada from the start of the sample period, but began falling in the mid 1990s after government cutbacks. Unemployment duration was then similar across the two countries until the mid-2000s, but then shot up in the US with the onset of the Great Recession. Generally, the paths of unemployment duration document the stark differences in the severity of the Great Recession across the US and Canada.

[18] The last three plot display broad macro trends across the two countries. In general, the US enjoyed higher levels of labor market participation and employment, relative to population, until the mid-1970s. From there, Canada experienced elevated levels of labor market participation, but a similar employment-population rate until the 1990s when the tech boom fueled the US economy. Then, beginning in 2000, the economies began to diverge, with employment-to-population increasing in Canada and languishing in the US. Both countries suffered employment losses during the Great Recession, but the dropoff in the US was much more severe. Interestingly, by the end of our sample, the employment-population ratio in both countries failed to recovered to its pre-crisis peak. Last, the bottom-right plot shows annual hours worked per worker. Hours worked fell similarly across the US and Canada until 1980, when hours worked began to increase slightly in the US.

which are far less dependent on fishing alone.

Although construction is often a leading indicator of macroeconomic growth, it must be interpreted cautiously as an economic indicator, since it is largely a consequence . Moreover, cities with the highest housing prices, often. . Nevertheless, areas along the coasts and nicer climates have generally seen what appears to be amenity-driven migration. Rappaport (2007).

Both countries also have areas, somewhat more dispersed, that benefit has generally been an uptick . While construction jobs collapsed in the United States after the housing bust of 2007-2008, construction in Canada remained relateively strong.[19]

5.2 Changes in immigration patterns

Immigration patterns in Canada are much more tilted towards Asian immigrants, with much higher educational attainment than the largely Latin American immigrants to the U.S. In both cases, we in figure 8, we see high levels of segregation of Latin Americans in the U.S., and Asians in Canada across metro areas. Canada also receives a larger share of English, French, other Western, and Southern European immigrants, who tend to be more uniformly distributed across the country.

6 The Impact of Labor Demand Shifts and Increases in Immigration

Below we combine well-known approaches to study sectoral labor demand shifts.

Numerous studies, from Bartik (1991), Blanchard and Katz (1992), Bound and Holzer (2000), Autor and Duggan (n.d.), Moretti (2004), have all examined the impact of demand

[19]For key industries – manufacturing, construction, and natural resources – figure 5 shows the employment and mean hourly wages (relative to the national average) for North America overall and for Canada relative to the US. As seen in the figure, manufacturing comprises the bulk of North American employment within these sectors, but from 1979 to 2010 manufacturing employment declined nearly 40 percent. Manufacturing wages have similarly fallen and in 2010 dipped below the North American average. Before 1995, Canadian manufacturing employment was consistently one-tenth of that in the US (bottom-left plot) before rising slightly in the late 1990s and leveling in the 2000s. Manufacturing wages in Canada, relative to the US, have followed a similar pattern, rising from the early 1990s to the mid-2000s and then falling during the great recession. Unlike manufacturing, employment in the North American construction sector doubled over the sample period and peaked at the height of the housing boom in 2006. The bottom-left plot shows that relative construction employment between the Canada and the US remained relatively steady until the Great Recession when US housing crashed and Canadian prices only suffered a minor episode of price depreciation. Construction wages are notably higher than those in manufacturing, but have slightly reverted back to the North American average over the sample period. Figure 5 also shows that while natural resources employment is insubstantial for North America overall, that this industry is highly concentrated in Canada relative to other sectors. Indeed, at the peak of oil prices in the mid-2000s, nearly half of all natural resource workers were in Canada. The top-right plot in the figure shows that wages are substantially higher in the natural resource and were nearly 40 percent higher than the North American average in 2015. The bottom-right plot shows that natural resource wages in Canada exploded, relative to the US, in the 1990s and remained at these elevated levels through the end of the sample.

shifts on local employment and wages, as well as the propensity to enroll in income maintenance programs.

The standard method of accounting for these demand shifts is based on the predicted change in employment at the local level, based on pre-exisitng industrial composition and national changes in the share of hours worked in the industry.

6.1 Labor Demand Shifts from Sectoral Changes

We first consider aggregate labor demand shifts predicted by the Bartik-instrument

$$\Delta B_j^t = \sum_l \lambda_{jl}^{1980} \left(E_{kl}^t - E_{ik}^{1980} \right) \tag{5}$$

where λ_{jl}^{1980} is the share of employment in city j that is in industry l in the base year of 1980. $\left(E_{kl}^t - E_{ik}^{1980} \right)$ is the change in overall employment in industry l of country k between time t and the base year.

The first-stage of this empirical design is simply to regress actual employment changes on predicted changes. Overall, employment changes over the entire sample period using the Bartik instrument are almost one-for-one in both the United States and Canada. This contrasts with studies using the 1980s only, that generally finds a coefficient near 2. The population predictions are also roughly similar.

6.2 Labor Supply Shifts from Shifts in Source Countries

Changes in the source countries sending immigrants to the U.S., and Canada, which may be plausibly taken as exogenous to local labor markets, may be used to try and identify the impact of immigrant labor on the labor market outcomes. We use current enclaves of Following Card (2001) and Card and Lemieux (2001), we denote the predicted immigration flow as

$$\Delta C_j^t = \sum_l \kappa_{js}^{1980} \left(M_{ks}^t - M_{ks}^{1980} \right) \tag{6}$$

where κ_{js}^{1980} is the share of the population that was born in source country s that is in the base year of 1980. $\left(M_{ks}^t - M_{ks}^{1980} \right)$ is the change in overall the number of adults from source country s of destination country k between time t and the base year.

6.3 Aggregate Results

Results for the aggregate index are shown in table ?? and shown in figure **??**. We follow previous authors in using an unweighted regression, but refer the reader to appendix table ?? for weighted regression.[20]

In figure 1A, the first stage relationship between predicted local labor demand changes is strong in the United States. Even over a gap of 27 years, 1 point increase in predicted employment predicts about 2.5 points of actual employment in both the weighted and unweighted regressions. Most rust belt cities that were predicted to fall behind in fact did. Many of the positive outliers are cities are generally in sunny warm places like Florida and Texas (see Glaesr and Tobio (2008), Rappaport (2007)). In terms of wages, the gains are 0.5 in the unweighted regression, and 1.0 in the weighted. This is consistent with the growing wage gradients discussed above.

In Canada, the first stage relationship appears decidedly weaker, with a marginally significant coefficient of 1 in the weighted regression and an effective zero in the unweighted regression. Cities such as Oshawa, Guelph, and Kitchener defied sectoral shifts against them. In terms of wages, these cities have prospered, defying the Bartik prediction. Cities that fall the most below the regression line include Sudbury, Winnipeg, and Thunder.

The first stage for predicted immigration shows that Vancouver and Toronto were expected to receive roughly as much immigration as San Francisco and Chicago. The U.S. had cities with enclaves better to attract its new immigrants in Miami and Los Angeles, not to mention the Hispanophone metros. Montreal, on the other hand, had relatively little to expect; the rest of Quebec far less.

When we combine these competing forces in table ??, somewhat standard results for the U.S. emerge: one predicted job results in one actual job; and the wage rises by about a quarter as much. In a competitive model, this result indicates an elasticity of local labor supply of roughly four in a typical city.[21]. Unemployment is also reduced by a substantial amount.

The interacted estimates for Canada essential negate the U.S. results exactly. While we cannot rule out small (even negative) estimates, the evidence seems to suggest a number

[20] Results decade by decade are available by request.

[21] The weighted estimates imply a much lower elasticity, which results from a combination of city size, geography, and land-use regulations **?**

closer to zero for both employment and wages. This implies that on the whole labor is not mobile and that wages are not responsive to demand shifts. Instead, what we see is greater negative unemployment shock. Thus, instead of wages adjusting or workers migrating to other cities, Canadians after a downturn simply stay out of work. They may find this easier with more generous government transfers, which could in turn reduce their incentives to move across cities.

The implied effects immigration largely reinforce those for the U.S. Immigrants may have an important, but not enormous, if imprecisely estimated negative impact on employment, leading to greater unemployment, but with no discernible impact on the wage. The point estimate suggests that immigrants could even have a positive effect on native wages.

Notice that throughout this period, the coefficient on Quebec is negative for wages, but also unemployment. Perhaps as the economy has turned more Francophone workers have found it easier to find jobs, even as pay for them has fallen, perhaps as wages have equilibrated to reflect a relatively lower level of productivity. Hispanophone communities, appear to be attracting native employment regardless of decadal changes in immigration, an

6.4 Employment Changes by Sub-Group - Coming Soon

7 Conclusion

It is clear from the above analysis that there are several ways that local labor markets within the U.S. and Canada differ more than between them. The differences between these two countries really is that small. The importance of the border, different currencies, and political climates should not be understated. At the same time, it is worth noting that many phenomena perceived as "Canadian" are somewhat localized. For instance, low employment numbers appear to be largely a phenomenon seen in the East, i.e., Quebec and the Atlantic areas. While immigration levels have been very heavy in some parts of Canada, the Prairies as well as the East, have experience levels about as low as the American Midwest.

Although the evidence in Canada is limited by its small number of cities, a number of impressions emerge. In terms of wages, the difference between urban and rural in Canada appears to be smaller, except perhaps at the fringes. The difference appears to be growing in both countries. Inequality has also been tamer in Canada's larger cities, although that too appears to have changed. Our evidence also confirms that there is a growing divergence between areas in terms of education.

While the large majority of each country speaks English at home, each contains a sizable communities where English is not the preferred language of communication. Both Francophone and Hispanophone communities struggle in having wages grow at the same rate as the rest of the country. The Francophone community is marked by lower levels of inequality — resembling Europe and resisting trends in the Anglosphere — with moderate levels of immigration. The Hispanophone community has high and increasing levels of inequality — resembling Latin America — while receiving many more immigrants.

The manufacturing belt of Canada appears to have survived better than the one in the U.S., even while maintaining a fairly high level of unionization. The West Coast of the U.S. saw much greater wage gains than the coast further up. Both countries show signs of their communities diverging, with disadvantaged areas at risk of falling further and further behind.

References

Albouy, David (2008) 'The Wage Gap between Francophones and Anglophones: A Canadian Perspective, 1970-2000.' *Canadian Journal of Economics* 41(4), 1211–1238

_ (2009) 'The unequal geographic burden of federal taxation.' *Journal of Political Economy* 117(4), 635–667

_ (2012) 'Evaluating the efficiency and equity of federal fiscal equalization.' *Journal of Public Economics* 96(9), 824–839

_ (2016) 'What Are Cities Worth? Land Rents, Local Productivity, and the Total Value of Amenities.' *Review of Economics and Statistics* 98(3), 477–87

Albouy, David, Fernando Leibovici, and Casey Warman (2013) 'Quality of life, firm productivity and the value of amenities across canadian cities.' *Canadian Journal of Economics* 46(2), 379–411

Autor, David H., and Mark G. Duggan 'The rise in the disability rolls and the decline in unemployment.' *Quarterly Journal of Economics* pp. 157–205

Aydemir, Abdurrahman, and George J. Borjas (2007) 'Cross-Country Variation in the Impact of International Migration: Canada, Mexico, and the United States.' *Journal of the European Economic Association* 5(4), 663–708

Barro, Robert J., Xavier Sala-I-Martin, Olivier Jean Blanchard, and Robert E.Hall (1991) 'Convergence Across States and Regions.' *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 1991, 108–182

Bartik, Timothy J. (1991) *Who Benefits from State and Local Economic Development Policies?* Books from Upjohn Press (W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research)

Basso, Gaetano, and Giovanni Peri (2015) 'The association between immigration and labor market outcomes in the united states.' *IZA Discussion Paper Series*

Battle, Ken (1998) 'Transformation: Canadian social policy since 1985.' *Social Policy & Administration* 32(4), 321–340

Baum-Snow, Nathaniel, and Ronni Pavan (2013) 'Inequality and city size.' *Review of Economics and Statistics*

Blanchard, Olivier, and Lawrence Katz (1992) 'Regional evolutions.' *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 1992(1), 1–61

Borjas, George J. (1993) 'Immigration policy, national origin, and immigrant skills: A comparison of canada and the united states.' In *Small Differences that Matter: Labor Markets and Income Maintenance in Canada and the United States,* ed. David Card and Richard B Freeman (University of Chicago Press) pp. 21–44

Bound, John, and Harry Holzer (2000) 'Demand shfits, population adjustments, and labor market outcomes during the 1980s.' *Journal of Labor Economics* 18(1), 20–54

Busso, Matias, Jesse Gregory, and Patrick Kline (2013) 'Assessing the incidence and efficiency of a prominent place based policy.' *The American Economic Review* 103(2), 897–947

Canada, Statistics (2013) *Language Use in th Workplace in Canada*

Card, David (1992) 'The effect of unions on the distribution of wages: Redistribution or relabelling?' *NBER Working Paper*

_ (2001) 'Immigrant Inflows, Native Outflows, and the Local Labor Market Impacts of Higher Immigration.' *Journal of Labor Economics* 19(1), 22–64

_ (2003) 'Canadian emigration to the united states.' *mimeo*

Card, David, and Richard B Freeman (1993) 'Introduction.' In *Small differences that matter: Labor markets and income maintenance in Canada and the United States,* ed. David Card and Richard B Freeman (University of Chicago Press)

Card, David, and Thomas Lemieux (2001) 'Can falling supply explain the rising return to college for younger men? a cohort-based analysis.' *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116(2), 705–746

Coulombe, Serge, and Frank C Lee (1995) 'Convergence across canadian provinces, 1961 to 1991.' *Canadian Journal of Economics* pp. 886–898

DiNardo, John, and Thomas Lemieux (1997) 'Diverging male wage inequality in the united states and canada, 1981-1988: Do institutions explain the difference.' *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 50(4), 629–651

DiNardo, John, Nicole M Fortin, and Thomas Lemieux (1996) 'Labor market institutions and the distribution of wages, 1973-1992: A semiparametric approach.' *Econometrica* 64(5), 1001–1044

Freeman, Richard (1990) 'On the divergence in unionism among developed countries.' *Labour Relations and Economic Performance* pp. 304–325

Freeman, Richard B (1993) 'How much has deunionization contributed to the rise of male earnings inequality? in sheldon danziger and peter gottschalk, eds.' *Uneven Tides: Rising Income Inequality in America. New York: Russell Sage Foundation* 133, 63

Glaesr, Edward L., and Kristina Tobio (2008) 'The rise of the sunbelt.' *Southern Economic Journal* 74(3), 610–643

Hirsch, Barry T, and David A Macpherson (2004) *Union Membership and Earnings Data Book: Compilations from the Current Population Survey* (Bureau of National Affairs)

Holmes, Thomas J. (1998) 'The effect of state policies on the location of manufacturing: Evidence from state borders.' *Journal of Political Economy* 106(4), 667–05

Hurst, Erik, Kerwin Kofi Charles, and Matthew J. Notowidigo (2016) 'The masking of the decline in manufacturing employment by the housing bubble.' *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30(2), 179–200

Katz, Lawrence F, and Kevin M Murphy (1992) 'Changes in relative wages, 1963-1987: Supply and demand factors.' *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107(1), 35–78

Krugman, Paul (1991) *Geography and Trade* (MIT Press)

Lee, David (1999) 'Wage inequality in the united states during the 1980s: Rising dispersion or falling minimum wage?' *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 114(3), 977–1022

Lemieux, Thomas (2008) 'The changing nature of wage inequality.' *Journal of Population Economics* 21(1), 21–48

Levy, Frank, and Peter Temin (2011) 'Inequality and institutions in twentieth-century america.' *Economic Evolution and Revolution in Historical Time* p. 357

Logan, John (2006) 'The union avoidance industry in the united states.' *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 44(4), 651–675

Moretti, Enrico (2004) 'Estimating the social return to higher education: evidence from longitudinal and repeated cross-sectional data.' *Journal of Econometrics*

_ (2011) 'Local labor markets.' In *Handbook of Labor Economics,* ed. David Card, vol. 4b chapter 14, pp. 1207–1313

_ (2013) 'Real wage inequality.' *Applied Economics Journal: Economic Policy* 5(1), 65103

Osterman, Paul (2014) *Securing Prosperity: The American Labor Market: How It Has Changed and What To do About It* (Princeton University Press)


Rappaport, Jordan (2007) 'Moving to nice weather.' *Regional Science and Urban Economics* p. 375398

Riddell, W Craig (1993) 'Unionization in canada and the united states: A tale of two countries.' In *Small Differences that Matter: Labor Markets and Income Maintenance in Canada and the United States,* ed. David Card and Richard B Freeman (University of Chicago Press) pp. 109–148

Saez, Emmanuel, and Michael R Veall (2005) 'The evolution of high incomes in northern america: lessons from canadian evidence.' *The American Economic Review* 95(3), 831–849


8 Figures

Figure 1: US and Canada – Employment, Unemployment, and Wages by Metro Area




Notes: Employment, the unemployment rate, and nominal weekly wages for the US and Canada. In each panel, the dashed-line is a weighted regression line using population in 1980. Text within each plot also shows the weighted mean and weighted standard deviation for both 1980/1981 and 2006/2007. The grey line is 45 degree line.

Figure 2: US and Canada – Skill and Inequality by Metro Area




Notes: Skill and inequality by metro area. Panel 1 shows the Katz-Murphy labor supply index which is the ratio of university graduates plus one-third of the post-secondary

Figure 3: US and Canada – 10 Percentile - Wage Ratio by Metro Area




Notes: 10th Percentile minus the minimum wage by metro area.

Figure 4: Union Coverage by Metro Area




Notes: Percentage workers covered by a union within each metro area.

Figure 5: Manufacturing, Construction, and Natural Resources Employment




Notes: Data from Datastream and Statistics Canada. US Datastream Employment Codes: USEMPMANO (All Manufacturing), USEM23..O (Construction), USEMIU..O (Natural Resources), USEM3360O (Auto Manufacturing). US Datastream Wage Codes: USWRIP..B (US Average), USWAGMANA (All Manufacturing), USWR23..A (Construction), USWRIU..B (Natural Resources). Canada Datastream Employment Codes: CN968122 (All Manufacturing), CN968121 (Employed Construction), CN968119 (Natural Resources). Canada Datastream Wage Codes: CNWAGES.A (Canada Average), CNWAGMANA (All Manufacturing), CN181928 (Construction), CN181921 (Natural Resources). Canada auto manufacturing data from CANSIM table 281-0024. North American mean hourly wages are weighted by country-level population.

Figure 6: US and Canada – Theil concentration Indices across Industries




Notes: Theil Concentration indices for the US and Canada. Higher values signal higher concentration.

Figure 7: Immigrant Inflows by Region of Birth




Notes: US Data from 2000 Census, 2010 ACS and 2014 ACS. Canadian data from OECD International Migration Database (MIG). East Asian Countries include those in East Asia and Southeast Asia.

Figure 8: Immigrant Shares and Dissimilarity




Notes: National Shares of immigrants by region of birth and the Duncan and Duncan (1955) dissimilarity index.

Figure 9: US and Canada – Employment and Wages by Predicted Labor Demand



Notes: Employment and Wages by Predicted labor demand.

Figure 10: US and Canada – Employment and Wages by Predicted Labor Supply



Notes: Employment and Wages by Predicted labor supply.

9 Tables

Table 1: Summary Statistics

	1980		2007	
	Mean (1)	Std Dev (2)	Mean (3)	Std Dev (4)
Panel A: United States				
Emp-Pop Ratio	0.72	0.04	0.76	0.04
Real Weekly Wage (2010$)	701.71	75.48	1009.56	117.38
Ln 90-10 Percentile Wage Ratio	1.76	0.11	1.92	0.11
High School (%)	38.10	5.79	27.84	6.02
Bachelor or more (%)	21.60	5.42	31.70	7.84
Ln Bachelor-HS Wage Ratio	0.33	0.10	0.54	0.13
Panel B: Canada				
Emp-Pop Ratio	0.73	0.06	0.79	0.05
Real Weekly Wage (2010$)	942.26	89.23	1026.02	131.65
Ln 90-10 Percentile Wage Ratio	1.65	0.11	1.86	0.11
High School (%)	12.95	3.23	23.74	3.87
Bachelor or more (%)	12.97	3.79	24.86	6.63
Ln Bachelor-HS Wage Ratio	0.34	0.07	0.37	0.08

Table 2: Population Gradients and Linguistic Isolation Effects for Local Labor Markets in the U.S. & Canada: 1980 to 2007

	Log Weekly Wage (1)	Unemp-ment Rate (2)	Employ-to-Pop Labor (3)	Log Univ/HS Labor (4)	Log Univ/HS Wage (5)	Log 90/10 Wage (6)
Panel A: Pooled Across Years						
Log Population	0.072***	0.113	-0.002	0.083***	0.027***	0.017***
	(0.005)	(0.057)	(0.002)	(0.017)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Log Population X Canada	-0.030***	-0.260*	0.007	0.001	-0.014	-0.022***
	(0.007)	(0.119)	(0.003)	(0.021)	(0.008)	(0.004)
Quebec	-0.125***	1.991***	-0.046***	-0.126*	0.008	-0.055***
	(0.015)	(0.309)	(0.006)	(0.050)	(0.020)	(0.013)
Hispanophone Metro	-0.162***	3.259***	-0.098***	-0.354***	0.102***	0.042***
	(0.049)	(0.438)	(0.011)	(0.073)	(0.024)	(0.011)
Panel B: With Time Interactions						
Log Population	0.053***	0.047	0.001	0.087***	0.008	0.000
	(0.004)	(0.072)	(0.003)	(0.012)	(0.005)	(0.002)
Log Pop X Decade	0.013**	0.042*	-0.001	-0.002	0.012***	0.011***
	(0.005)	(0.021)	(0.001)	(0.008)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Log Population X Canada	-0.031***	-0.716***	0.017***	-0.056**	-0.014*	-0.030***
	(0.007)	(0.142)	(0.004)	(0.020)	(0.006)	(0.005)
Log Pop X Decade X Canada	-0.000	0.272***	-0.006***	0.036***	-0.001	0.005*
	(0.005)	(0.053)	(0.001)	(0.010)	(0.004)	(0.002)
Quebec	-0.031	3.560***	-0.098***	-0.131**	0.033***	-0.039**
	(0.018)	(0.277)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.049)	(0.013)
Quebec X Decade	-0.059***	-0.975***	0.033***	0.006	-0.015	-0.009*
	(0.009)	(0.096)	(0.002)	(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.004)
Hispanophone Metro	-0.106**	2.791***	-0.083***	-0.172	0.112**	0.003
	(0.039)	(0.559)	(0.015)	(0.091)	(0.034)	(0.015)
Hispan. Metro X Decade	-0.032**	0.284	-0.009**	-0.109***	-0.005	0.024***
	(0.011)	(0.171)	(0.003)	(0.028)	(0.018)	(0.005)
Metro-Decades	1232	1232	1232	1232	1232	1232

Notes: Sample consists of 276 metro areas in the United States — observed in 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2007 — and 32 in Canada — observed in 1981, 1991, 2001, and 2006. Regression Standard errors are clustered by metro area. Weighted by population ages 24 to 59. Indicator variables for each year interacted with country are included.

Table 3: Regressions of Log Wage Differences of Different Skill Types over Space

	Less than High School Wage		Some College Wage		More than Bachelor Degree Wage	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
High-School Wage	1.414***	1.194***	0.547***	0.518***	-0.007	0.244***
	(0.046)	(0.036)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.030)	(0.024)
Bachelor Deg. Wage	-0.411***	-0.217***	0.443***	0.469***	1.047***	0.820***
	(0.043)	(0.033)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.028)	(0.023)
H.S Wage X Canada	-0.302**	-0.206	0.236***	0.260***	0.166*	-0.199*
	(0.110)	(0.121)	(0.047)	(0.052)	(0.075)	(0.081)
B.D. Wage X Canada	0.239*	-0.002	-0.242***	-0.282***	-0.248***	-0.019
	(0.108)	(0.101)	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.072)	(0.090)
Metro-Decades	1801	1801	1801	1801	1801	1801
Time X Country FE		Yes		Yes		Yes


Notes: Sample consists of 276 metro areas in the United States — observed in 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2007 — and 32 in Canada — observed in 1981, 1991, 2001, and 2006. Regression Standard errors are clustered by metro area.

Table 4: Effect of Predict Labor Demand Shifts and Immigration Changes on Local Labor Market Outcomes for the Entire Population and Natives Only: 1980 to 2007

	Dependent variable: Decadal Change in					
	All Employ-ment	All Weekly Wages	All Unemploy. Rate	Native Employ-ment	Native Weekly Wages	Nativ Unemploy. Rate
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Predicted Emp. Chg.	0.974***	0.238***	−0.028***	0.828***	0.297***	−0.086***
	(0.091)	(0.046)	(0.008)	(0.078)	(0.044)	(0.015)
Pred. Emp. Chg. X Canada	−1.033***	−0.322**	−0.039*	−1.058***	−0.415***	0.019
	(0.280)	(0.137)	(0.023)	(0.278)	(0.148)	(0.030)
Pred. Immig. Chg.	0.138	0.022	0.043***	−0.193*	0.063	0.133***
	(0.097)	(0.044)	(0.009)	(0.106)	(0.051)	(0.018)
Pred. Imm. Chg. X Canada	0.193	0.142	0.042*	0.052	0.342	−0.031
	(0.464)	(0.213)	(0.025)	(0.455)	(0.245)	(0.051)
Quebec	−0.014	−0.053***	−0.006***	−0.036	−0.051***	−0.022***
	(0.024)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.023)	(0.009)	(0.003)
Hispanophone Community	0.053*	−0.030**	−0.005	0.073*	−0.018	−0.029***
	(0.027)	(0.014)	(0.004)	(0.038)	(0.017)	(0.009)
Partial R^2	0.19	0.18	0.22	0.16	0.18	0.16
Observations	924	924	924	924	924	924

Notes: Sample consists of 276 metro areas in the United States — observed in 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2007 — and 32 in Canada — observed in 1981, 1991, 2001, and 2006. Regression Standard errors are clustered by metro area. Weighted by population ages 24 to 59. Columns 1, 3, and 5 include a control for country. Indicator variables for each year interacted with country are included in columns 2, 4, and 6.

Figure A1: Labor Market Trends–US and Canada



Notes: All Variables are from OECD Statistics. The trade union density is the number of wage and salary workers that are trade union members as a percentage of all wage and salary workers; the real hourly minimum wage is the statutory federal minimum wage converted into 2014 US dollars; the Gross Replacement Rate (unemployment insurance compensation) is the unemployment benefit level as a percentage of previous gross earnings; Unemployment Compensation as a percentage of GDP is the unemployment compensation and severance pay divided by GDP; the unemployment duration is the average unemployment duration in months for workers whose age is greater than or equal to 15 years; and annual hours worked is the total number of hours worked per year divided the total number of (both part- and full-time) workers.

Table A1: Effect of Demand Shifts

	Dependent variable:					
	All Employ-ment	All Weekly Wages	All Unemploy. Rate	Native Employment Employment	Native Weekly Wages	Nativ Unemploy. Rate
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Predicted Emp.	0.947^{***}	0.451^{***}	-0.038^{***}	0.698^{***}	0.528^{***}	-0.070^{***}
	(0.156)	(0.078)	(0.012)	(0.154)	(0.086)	(0.020)
Pred. Emp. Chg. X Canada	-0.512^{*}	-0.583^{**}	-0.103^{***}	-0.577^{**}	-0.657^{**}	-0.042
	(0.277)	(0.271)	(0.039)	(0.263)	(0.275)	(0.041)
Pred. Immig. Chg.	-0.152	0.039	0.037^{***}	-0.598^{***}	0.171	0.087^{***}
	(0.189)	(0.306)	(0.019)	(0.184)	(0.365)	(0.032)
Pred. Imm. Chg. X Canada	0.423^{**}	0.210	0.108^{***}	0.340^{*}	0.385	0.049
	(0.464)	(0.213)	(0.025)	(0.455)	(0.245)	(0.051)
Quebec	-0.030^{***}	-0.044^{***}	-0.004^{***}	-0.040^{***}	-0.045^{***}	-0.025^{***}
	(0.012)	(0.007)	(0.001)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.002)
Hispanophone	0.106^{***}	-0.053^{*}	-0.005^{**}	0.172^{***}	-0.066^{**}	-0.016^{***}
	(0.040)	(0.027)	(0.002)	(0.052)	(0.033)	(0.005)
Observations	924	924	924	924	924	924