Discussion of
Send Them Back? The Real Estate Consequences of Repatriations
by Gustavo S. Cortes and Vinicios P. Sant'Anna

Min Fang
University of Lausanne & University of Geneva
April 29, 2021 @ UEA Europe 2021 (Copenhagen)

The BIG Question: Why is immigration important?

- The spatial allocation of human resource is potentially beneficial for the economy:

  *In the perspective of international trade, voluntary immigration would induce **"gain from trade"**.*

The BIG Question: Why is immigration important?

- The spatial allocation of human resource is potentially beneficial for the economy:

  *In the perspective of international trade, voluntary immigration would induce "**gain from trade**".*

- However, immigration is complicated since only the welfare of "home country" is considered:

  *The "**gain from trade**" may not be **Pareto improvement** for "home" and/or every "home" citizen.*

The BIG Question: Why is immigration important?

- The spatial allocation of human resource is potentially beneficial for the economy:

  In the perspective of international trade, voluntary immigration would induce "gain from trade".

- However, immigration is complicated since only the welfare of "home country" is considered:

  The "gain from trade" may not be Pareto improvement for "home" and/or every "home" citizen.

- Therefore, sitting on the chair of "home" country policymaker:

  Understanding the consequences of immigration on "home" country is especially important.

The BIG Question: Why is immigration important?

- The spatial allocation of human resource is potentially beneficial for the economy:

  *In the perspective of international trade, voluntary immigration would induce **"gain from trade"**.*

- However, immigration is complicated since only the welfare of "home country" is considered:

  *The **"gain from trade"** may not be **Pareto improvement** for "home" and/or every "home" citizen.*

- Therefore, sitting on the chair of "home" country policymaker:

  Understanding the consequences of immigration on "home" country is especially important.

Summary of the paper

An estimation to quantify the impact of immigration on local economic growth:

1. Difficulties: Identification Issues because of Self-selection & Macro conditions
   - Worker heterogeneity in ability, preferences, social connections affects choices;
   - City heterogeneity in economics, social, cultural conditions affects choices and vice versa;

An estimation to quantify the impact of immigration on local economic growth:

1. Difficulties: Identification Issues because of Self-selection & Macro conditions
   - Worker heterogeneity in ability, preferences, social connections affects choices;
   - City heterogeneity in economics, social, cultural conditions affects choices and vice versa;

2. Solution: An Instrumental Variable Approach from a quasi-natural experiment
   - Variation: The repatriation of Mexican immigrants in the US from 1930 to 1936
   - IV: Historical migration share (IV1) & Proximity $\times$ Historical migration share (IV2)

Summary of the paper

An estimation to quantify the impact of immigration on local economic growth:

1. Difficulties: Identification Issues because of Self-selection & Macro conditions
   - Worker heterogeneity in ability, preferences, social connections affects choices;
   - City heterogeneity in economics, social, cultural conditions affects choices and vice versa;

2. Solution: An Instrumental Variable Approach from a quasi-natural experiment
   - Variation: The repatriation of Mexican immigrants in the US from 1930 to 1936
   - IV: Historical migration share (IV1) & Proximity $\times$ Historical migration share (IV2)

- Results:
   - Significant negative effects on both supply side and demand side
   - More prominent results for low value houses

Comment One: On Magnitudes

The Core Regression:

$$\underset{1930:40}{\Delta} Y_c = \alpha + \beta \cdot \tilde{O}^{MEX}_{1930:40,c} \left(IV_c^{(1)|(2)} \right) + \lambda_s + \mathbf{X}_{c,1930} + \epsilon_c,$$

$\underline{x : \Delta \textbf{population}(\%) \Rightarrow y : \Delta \textbf{housing variables}(\%), \text{both from 30' to 40'}}$

Comment One: On Magnitudes

The Core Regression:

$$\underset{1930:40}{\Delta} \Upsilon_c = \alpha + \beta \cdot \tilde{O}_{1930:40,c}^{MEX} \left(IV_c^{(1)|(2)} \right) + \lambda_s + \mathbf{X}_{c,1930} + \epsilon_c,$$

$x : \Delta\mathbf{population}(\%) \Rightarrow y : \Delta\mathbf{housing\ variables}(\%)$, both from 30' to 40'

The quantities (β's) seem too large to be explained (?)

- 1% $\downarrow$ of working-age population $\Rightarrow$ 13% $\downarrow$ growth of building permits (number)
- 1% $\downarrow$ of working-age population $\Rightarrow$ 03% $\downarrow$ growth of building permits (value)
- 1% $\downarrow$ of working-age population $\Rightarrow$ 01% $\downarrow$ growth of median house value

Comment One: On Magnitudes

The Core Regression:

$$\underset{1930:40}{\Delta} Y_c = \alpha + \beta \cdot \tilde{O}^{MEX}_{1930:40,c} \left(IV_c^{(1)|(2)} \right) + \lambda_s + \mathbf{X}_{c,1930} + \epsilon_c,$$

$\underline{x : \Delta \textbf{population}(\%) \Rightarrow y : \Delta \textbf{housing variables}(\%), \text{both from 30' to 40'}}$

The quantities (β's) seem too large to be explained (?)

- 1% $\downarrow$ of working-age population $\Rightarrow$ 13% $\downarrow$ growth of building permits (number)
- 1% $\downarrow$ of working-age population $\Rightarrow$ 03% $\downarrow$ growth of building permits (value)
- 1% $\downarrow$ of working-age population $\Rightarrow$ 01% $\downarrow$ growth of median house value

A potential reason: State Senator Joseph Dunn says ~ 60% repatriated Mexican (race) are actually American Citizen, maybe an underestimation of the working-age population loss.

Comment Two: On Identification

- **In general, I think IV2 is quite clean to me.**
    1. unlikely that the share of Mexicans in 00' is correlated with a city's fundamental in 30'
    2. 00's share is still sufficiently associated with the size of the Mexican population in 30'
    3. infrastructure also had an important role in the repatriation (cost side)

Comment Two: On Identification

- **In general, I think IV2 is quite clean to me.**
    1. unlikely that the share of Mexicans in 00' is correlated with a city's fundamental in 30'
    2. 00's share is still sufficiently associated with the size of the Mexican population in 30'
    3. infrastructure also had an important role in the repatriation (cost side)

- **Still some potential concerns:**
    1. Repatriation is informal, so local gov't's strictness on Mexican's welfare, Z, is unobserved
    2. Similar, if we consider local corporations' willingness on hiring Mexican, Z, is unobserved
       Z could be correlated with IV2: Mexican is more represented $\Rightarrow$ Gov't/corp is more strict

Comment Three: Just Immigration or Maybe More?

- **Direct vs Indirect Effects** (also about the magnitudes)
  - The results are attributed to direct effects from Mexican's demand and supply
  - How about indirect effects, i.e., other Latino's expectations on themselves?
- **Short-run vs Long-run Effects**
  - The results are more focused on short-run: 10yrs' gap on 10yrs' gap
  - How should we think about the dynamic consequences in longer horizons?
- **How to link the results to welfare analysis?**
  - Regardless of ethical issues, would we consider negative effects on housing market as?
  - Good or Bad welfare implications for "home" citizen?

Conclusion

- An interesting paper with clean identification.

- An important question asked and clearly answered.

- Will be interesting to extend further to think more about mechanism and welfare.