Immigrant entry to smaller urban centres and coordination with local labour markets in Canada: Effects of the Provincial Nominee Program (PNP)

by Colin McCann

5565756

Major Paper presented to the
Department of Economics of the University of Ottawa
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the M.A. Degree

Supervisor: Serge Nadeau

ECO 6999

Ottawa, Ontario
December 2014

Abstract

Canada has historically been and continues to be an immigrant nation. Despite debates on the true economic effects of immigration, it is generally considered by Canadians as a desirable way to grow and develop the economy, labour force, and population. However, Canada's expanse and regional diversity has led to a varied immigration landscape – major cities accepting larger numbers of immigrants relative to native Canadians than smaller cities. The Provincial Nominee Program (PNP) was implemented in the late 1990s and early 2000s in part to address this. Under the PNP, Provinces and Territories have more discretion on their immigrant intake. Using panel data for select Canadian cities over 12 years, this study investigates changes in the landing points of immigrants to Canada as a result of the PNP. It is shown that the PNP has had mixed results; successful at promoting more immigrant arrival to smaller but still major urban centres and some recent success at promoting immigrant arrival to areas in high demand for labour.

1. Introduction

Canada has long since been a destination country for immigrants. In contrast to other destination countries, Canada's experience is distinct in the sense that a) immigration has broad public approval, unlike some European countries that have recently become recipients of large numbers of immigrants, and b) has had some success with its policies that emphasize the pre-arrival employability of the economic migrants it accepts, in contrast to a more humanitarian focus on refugees

and the associated post-arrival adjustment (Reitz, 2012). Both factors are influenced by a general perception that immigration is a useful tool to grow the population and economy, despite ongoing debates about the true economic effects of immigration on the accepting country. However, over time the arrival of immigrants has become highly centralized in Canada's major cities, and in particular the "big three" of Toronto, Vancouver, and Montréal. Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) estimated that only 20% of all immigrants to Canada in the year 2000 intended to settle outside of those three cities (CIC, 2013b), and Carter (2009) estimates that in the period from 1996-2008, immigrants to these cities represented 75% of Canada's total, and Toronto in particular representing 54.9% of the national total, which are levels disproportional to overall population.

This trend of concentrated immigration is expected to continue into the future if unabated. Canada, like many other developed economies, is seeing a decline in its natural population growth rate. Statistics Canada has projected that under a medium-growth scenario, approximately 71.7% of Canada's growth to a national population of 43.8 million people in 2036 is expected to come from immigration (Statistics Canada, 2010). Projections extended to 2063 also forecast a continued net inter-provincial emigration from Altantic Canada, net inter-provincial immigration to Alberta and to a lesser extent Saskatchewan, and other regions of the country including Ontario and Québec relying more heavily on external immigration to account for the population increase (Statistics Canada, 2014). This does not bode well for the relative concentration of immigrants in Toronto, Montréal, and Vancouver. There are concerns that integration of newcomers may become more

difficult in such an environment, and this may worsen if enclaves further develop in these large immigrant cities – Toronto and Vancouver, for instance, are expected to have non-European majorities as early as 2017 (Bélanger and Malenfant, 2005).

Accordingly, many Canadians and policy makers have expressed a desire for changes to induce immigrants to settle across the country in more even levels to counteract this effect. In light of these concerns, the Provincial Nominee Program (PNP) was rolled out and expanded over the course of roughly a decade. The PNP is actually a series of agreements between the federal government and provincial governments that allow provinces to develop their own guidelines for the required/desired skill sets of prospective immigrants, but with some federal oversight. Provinces are responsible for designing their own requirements, recruiting prospective nominees, and monitoring and reporting on their own programs. CIC retains authority on the final decision to admit nominees into Canada based on if it is likely the nominees can establish themselves economically and reside in the province in which they were nominated, and if they actually intend to do so (Seidle, 2013). The PNP does not replace any existing federal entry streams like the Federal Skilled Worker (FSW) or the Temporary Foreign Worker (TFW) programs.

The PNP's rationale is that the provinces are more likely than the federal government to know their unique labour market demands in greater detail and that allowing them to build their own requirements should make it more likely a nominee will be able to find work in that region. In theory, easier labour market integration should provide an incentive to encourage immigrants to settle in less

populated regions of the country with smaller immigrant populations, be beneficial to the economic development of the accepting city or province, and prevent to some extent the development of enclaves. In this way it is a demographic and a socio-economic policy. For example, semi-skilled or intermediate level labour in industries such as agriculture or trades has been identified as a potential labour shortage in the country (see Bourgeois et al., 2006, and Kustec, 2012). As a result, several provinces and territories have identified immigration as a means to meet their labour market needs in industries such as these (see Saskatchewan Labour Market Commission (2009), Yukon Department of Education (2010)). The low-skill TFW and high-skill FSW programs are controlled at a federal level, and are therefore ill suited to changes to allow for provincial variation in the skill sets needed and especially at this intermediate skill level. In the eyes of these provinces, the PNP helps address this shortcoming and allow for a more flexible immigrant intake.

Initially, these programs were small when compared to the overall immigrant intake and were rolled out intermittently. Québec has had a large degree of control over it's own immigration policy since 1991 when the Canada-Québec Accord was signed, and this devolution served as the inspiration for related agreements with the other provinces. In 1998, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba signed agreements with the federal government. In 1999 New Brunswick and Newfoundland and Labrador signed their own agreements, as did Prince Edward Island in 2001 and Nova Scotia and Alberta in 2002. Reflecting the intention of the program to dissuade immigrants from arriving in the already most populous

regions of the country, Ontario was the last province to sign an agreement, which it did in 2005.

The House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, reflecting on the program in 2003, issued a report that proves illuminating. It highlighted that the PNP could be a valuable tool in the hands of less populous provinces hoping to attract more immigrants if properly implemented. But it also noted that it could be useful for major provinces since they could tailor their requirements and in theory disperse immigrants within a province as well. It further noted that as a result of the limited scope of the program and the strict limits placed on immigrants who could be nominated by provinces (e.g. Saskatchewan could initially only admit 1000 principal applicants over a four-year period), only 679 principal applicants were admitted under the PNP across Canada in 2002. Recognizing that such small intake hampers the program's effectiveness, the Committee recommended several changes that would empower the PNP, including supporting Provinces that set up their own immigration offices abroad and relaxing the limits placed on the number of provincial nominees (PNs). Over time, particularly post-2006, these limits have indeed been greatly relaxed or eliminated entirely in some provinces, as is the case in Manitoba, one province among others that admits a majority of it's immigrants through the PNP (Seidle, 2013).

This study, therefore, uses the years 2002 and 2013 as the start and end points of analysis on immigrant labour market entry under the PNP as it expanded. It investigates if immigrants arriving have shown more willingness to settle in Canada's smaller cities. It also investigates if they are moving in greater numbers to

the regions of the country that have lower unemployment rates as a measure of labour shortage. If the PNP is effective at promoting the dispersal of immigrants outside of the big three cities as well as improvements in labour market integration, PNP use should be associated with increased arrivals in smaller population centres and in population centres with lower unemployment rates. Moreover, this effect should be especially apparent in 2013 when compared to 2002.

Note that this study does not consider labour market outcomes *per se*. There is a large body of work that suggests immigrants have lower wages and are more susceptible to recessionary decreases in employment and/or earnings (e.g. Aydemir (2003), Abbott & Beach (2011)). If this effect is due to less experience in the Canadian labour market, nominees might be better off if the program effectively and quickly integrates them into the local labour market as intended. Conversely, the lower bar set for many admission streams to allow for skill levels lower than the FSW may predispose immigrants to positions more at risk of low and variable incomes. While whether or not nominees fare better in the medium term from an employment or earnings perspective after being admitted certainly is an interesting question, it is not answerable with this data set, and Pandey & Townsend (2011) have conducted an analysis that addresses some of these concerns. This study focuses only on the landing point of immigrants under the PNP and assumes that at least in the short term they may fare better if they arrive in smaller or growing population centres where their skills are in demand and in the long term Canada's economy may benefit as well.

2. Literature Review

Three major themes emerge from the literature review: the motives for immigrants' choices of place of residence; measures of PNP effectiveness based on qualitative methods or summary statistics; and concerns over retention of immigrants in the province of admission. All of the reviewed sources influenced the design of this study.

As might be expected, the first theme amounts to a sizeable body of work. Although overall Canada is an immigrant nation, the detailed picture is more nuanced; variations exist across regions or provinces as to the relative size of immigrant communities as well as the source country that is represented in a given region, province, or city. For example, although in 2006, immigrants from China and India accounted for roughly the same share of national immigration at 13.6% and 12.5% respectively, Chinese immigrants are the largest group to immigrate to central areas of the Toronto and Vancouver CMAs, but Indian immigrants are the largest immigrant groups to suburban areas of these CMAs such as Peel Region or Surrey (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2009). The same relationship does not hold for Montréal, where the largest source region is North Africa, nor for Winnipeg, where the largest source country is the Phillipines, and nor for Halifax and several smaller CMAs in Ontario, where the largest source region is the Middle East.

The most commonly proposed reasons behind immigrant settlement decisions are the presence of a) co-ethnic populations, and b) economic opportunities as the major draws to particular cities. Migration to cities with high

co-ethnic populations is sometimes called the "group affinity hypothesis" (Hou, (2007)) meaning immigrants might want to live in locations where they can expect to feel comfortable and have similar cultural/linguistic/social environments as in in their source country. Migration to cities with better economic opportunities is self-explanatory in the sense that immigrants should want to move to a place with better job prospects. There are, however, debates in the literature about whether or not one of these factors dominates the other, and the size of each factor relative to the other.

Xu and Liaw (2007) studied the destination of immigrants to Canada from four South Asian countries (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh) using a logit model and, while finding that the presence of co-ethnic communities is an important consideration for these groups, the size of this effect varies not just across groups but for different educational attainment and ages within groups as well. Alongside the observed positive effect that incomes in the accepting province have on destination, this seems to support the two commonly proposed considerations listed above. However, some studies (e.g. Thomas (2011), Hou (2007), and Chui (2003)) suggest that co-ethnic populations are perhaps the major consideration, if for somewhat different reasons than commonly argued. Thomas (2011) uses a probit model to show that the size and diversity of an individual immigrant's social network is what draws immigrants to larger cities, not the size of the co-ethnic population in general. This is line with Rebhun (2003) who argues the overall size of the Jewish immigrant community is insignificant as a determinant of Jewish

immigration to US states once the presence of immediate friends and family are considered for individual immigrants.

It may also be that co-ethnic population and economic opportunities are correlated. For instance, Alasia & Magnusson (2005) use Location Quotient[1] and Skill Specialization Quotient[2] analysis by regions to show that within regions of Canada, managerial and professional skill levels are more concentrated than average in urban centres while technical, intermediate, and unskilled workers are more concentrated than average in medium sized cities, suburbs, and rural areas. Furthermore, technical and intermediate skills are represented fairly even across regions, whereas the others are much more varied by region. If the different groups of immigrants to Canada have clustered skill sets due to underlying educational or economic realities in the source countries, this could lead to the apparent grouping of immigrants to specific regions or cities.

Taken together, the reviewed studies confirm the two main factors in immigrant settlement decisions that are commonly proposed, but also provide support to the PNP's rationale that aligning economic opportunities with the presence of immigrant social networks can support the growth of immigrant communities outside of Canada's major cities. Where these two forces are in concert rather than in contrast will almost surely be where most immigrants arrive.

---

[1] Location Quotients reflect the regional concentration of employment in a particular industry relative to the country as a whole. LQ=[(employment in industry *x* in region *a*/total employment in region *a*)/(employment in industry *x* nationally/total employment nationally)]. LQ >1 implies that region is more highly focused on that industry than nationally, <1 implies lower than nationally, and =1 implies equal to national average.

[2] Skill Specialization Quotients are calculated and interpreted similarly to Location Quotients but instead measure the ratio of observed skill sets in a region to the expected skills present for an identical industrial mix nationally. As a result, they express differences in skill sets within industries.

Regardless of the particular factor it is that draws immigrants to cities or regions that have co-ethnic populations (size, immediate social networks, variation in skills in the local economy), if the PNP is successful in promoting the arrival of immigrants to smaller regions, it should in theory promote longer-term stability and arrival. Following Alasia & Magnusson (2005), tailoring immigration strategy to the local labour market needs may attract immigrants in the immediate term, and following Hou (2007), the arrival of the first few via the PNP may promote chain migration on the part of those immigrants' friends and family. It remains to be seen, however, if this corrects the regional variations in the size the overall immigrant communities across the country but leaves untouched the composition of specific local immigrant communities.

Reviews of PNP outcomes are also apparent in the literature since some PNPs have been in place for a decade or more and accordingly provincial and federal governments have seen fit to conduct assessments of the programs' efficacy. These assessments prove illuminating, but are heavily qualitative at times or rely on rudimentary summary statistics. The assessments reviewed for this study include the PNPs of British Columbia and Manitoba as well as a general assessment of the program at the federal level by CIC.

British Columbia's Ministry of Jobs, Tourism, and Innovation's (2011) report on the BC PNP concluded that the program was a relative success in terms of how many people settled in areas outside of Metro Vancouver. Seventy-five percent of PNs settled in Metro Vancouver and the remainder outside, compared with ninety percent for FSWs and ninety-four percent for the federal Business Class in

particular. The Ministry noted that the tailoring of the criteria for the Business Class admission stream of its PNP specifically for types of enterprises found outside the Metro Vancouver area accounted for this success. The Ministry therefore concluded that the PNP is one way to distribute the flow of immigrants across a given province in the same way that it is hoped to do between provinces. 94% of all PNs reported they were employed full-time when surveyed, compared to 81% for a similar survey for FSWs, and that given the widespread concern that immigrants may not be able to work in their selected field (see Grenier & Xue (2011)), the Ministry reports that 85% of nominees felt the job they had found was a good match for their skill set, although no similar satisfaction levels were reported to compare against FSWs.

A similar review conducted for the province of Manitoba (Carter, 2009) reports some similarities and yet some notable differences. An estimated 35% of PNs to Manitoba settled outside of Winnipeg compared to 28% for all immigration streams. Contemporaneously with the PNP's use in Manitoba, the province has seen it's share of national arrivals increase from 1.8% in 1996-2000 to 4.6% in 2007-2008. However, in terms of economic outcomes Carter notes that in 2002, when the Manitoba PNP was still relatively nascent, 30% of survey respondents did not consider themselves in the work field of their choice, but by 2008 that number had actually increased to 50%. Frequently reported reasons included the seemingly paradoxical combination of non-recognition of foreign credentials and being over-qualified. This would appear to contradict the satisfaction results of BC's assessment.

The federal assessment (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2011) also addresses economic outcomes, but in this case, it is across the country. Overall, the satisfaction of nominees with the work they have found was estimated at 70%, meaning the results of BC rather than Manitoba for this measure are perhaps more representative. However, CIC also notes that although PNs are able to establish themselves in the labour market faster than FSWs, they do so at lower levels of pay. Table 1, below, shows the distribution of National Occupation Classification (NOC) categories for the PNP and the FSW streams for those principal applicants who arrived between 2005-2009. This is important to consider since most PNPs are explicitly designed to include intermediate skilled positions if they are locally in demand. According to CIC (2011), the slightly lower skill levels accounts for the differences in employment and incomes, but according to Carter (2009), this may also be due to poor job matching. The former would be an endorsement of the program while the latter represents an issue with program design.

Table 1: NOC skill type by admission category

NOC skill type	PNP (%)	FSW (%)
0-Senior management	5.5	1.2
1-Business, finance, and administration	13.3	17.8
2-Natural and applied Sciences	16.5	40.4
3-Health	7	8.1
4-Social Sciences, education, government, and religion	5.3	15.5
5-Art, culture, and recreation	2	3.6
6-Sales and service	15.2	8.8
7-Trades, transport, and equipment	24.3	3.6
8-Primary industry	3.1	0.2
9-Processing, manufacturing, and utilities	7.9	0.7

Source: *Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2011), Table 3-7, p. 25*

These assessments paint a slightly nuanced picture, if we consider both their intent and their results. They point to some success in terms of the demographic goals of the PNP, but arguably less so in terms of economic goals. It does appear that within provinces and across the country a more even distribution of immigrant settlement has been accomplished, if only slightly. A decrease (when compared to FSWs) in the proportion of immigrants to BC that settle in Metro Vancouver to 75% or a decrease in the proportion of immigrants to Manitoba that settle in Winnipeg to 65% are still vast majorities and are successes in relative terms only. But the picture is not as clear from an economic perspective.

In this study I take the perspective that labour market outcomes, which the above assessments use, are a poor measurement of economic opportunities that influence an immigrant's settlement decisions. If, as CIC has noted, PNP programs are tailored more to intermediate skill level occupations, incomes of PNs may well be lower, but there may be other considerations, such the real wage relative to what they would earn in their home country, or simply finding a job, that are important in settlement decisions. Moreover, by moving to regions of the country outside of major population centres and meeting local labour market needs, they may generate economic activity and successfully integrate into the labour market, irrespective of the income level at which they do so.

This may be particularly important in light of the supposed substitution effect of immigrant labour on native wages. In a simple closed economy model, immigration should lead to an influx of workers that increases labour supply but not necessarily labour demand, and accordingly reduce wages (Borjas, 2014). Van der

Waal's (2011) study of the labour market effects of immigration to Dutch cities, however, indicates that the effect may be different at a local rather than national level. Cities or regions with high labour demand may not experience the decreases in wages predicted by the substitution effect. Since the PNP is tailored to slightly less skilled workers than the FSW, and given regional differences in labour demand in Canada, the above assessments may have some measurement problems if they only consider the outcomes in the labour market. It may or may not be that an influx of immigrant labour has stalled wage growth in the sectors in which the PNs are working, but their arrival may still have facilitated economic activity beneficial to the accepting province, which is a clear motive of the program. Additionally, Borjas (2006) finds that overall US substitution effects may over-estimate the effects in US states, especially in environments with internal migration of native workers, which is arguably also the case in Canada. In any case, outcomes are after the fact and uncertain from the perspective of an immigrant considering where to settle, which is supposed to be a behaviour modified by the introduction of the PNP.

Another theme raised in the literature is concern over immigrant retention in the provinces or cities in which they arrived. This is particularly a problem for Atlantic Canada, as Akbari (2011) notes. Since stalled economic growth there has led to out-migration of natives, policy makers have started to see immigration as a means to prevent negative population growth. But if the immigrants arrive into the same economic situation, they too may leave as well. CIC (2011) reports the estimated retention rates for those PNs who arrived between 2000-2008 and were surveyed in 2008 as to whether or not they were residing in the province in which

they were nominated. Table 2, below, recreates this information for Atlantic Canada vs Western Canada and illustrates the scale of this issue for these provinces.

Table 2: Retention rates in 2008

	Retention (%)		Retention (%)
Atlantic Canada	56.4	Western Canada	86.5
NFLD	22.9	Manitoba	82.6
PEI	36.6	Saskatchewan	86
NS	68.4	Alberta	95.3
NB	68.1		

Source: *Table 4-5, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2011), p. 53*

Akbari (2011) reports that immigrants to Atlantic Canada have higher labour force participation rates and education levels than natives, and that during the time frame discussed above the region's share of immigrants that were admitted under the PNP increased from one quarter to one half. Akbari concludes that programs such as the PNP, although not exclusively the PNP, can help meet local labour market needs in a way that promotes retention and lead to the sort of economic restructuring or transition that would further promote immigrant arrival and retention in Atlantic Canada.

This is a position also taken elsewhere in the literature. Although most studies focus on the case of inter-provincial immigrant loss, Beshiri (2004) notes that rural regions typically do not have high numbers of immigrant arrivals nor retention since the human capital levels of FSWs are typically much higher than the local labour needs of these rural areas. This is why the House of Commons posited that Ontario should be included in the program if it wanted to promote immigration to Northern Ontario or other rural areas of the province. Accordingly, the PNP's

focus on intermediate skilled positions could also allow for greater retention in rural regions and promote gradual economic development there as well.

Several studies (e.g. Grenier & Xue (2011), Ostrovsky et al. (2008), Xu (2007) and Kelly et al. (2011)) support the notion that immigrants are highly mobile initially and that finding appropriate work quickly is crucial is in determining where it is they ultimately settle. Ostrovsky et al. (2008), for instance, note that within the first five years of landing, immigrants who had settled outside of Alberta were more likely than natives to move to Alberta, but those who had been residents for between 10-15 years were less likely to move than natives. Furthermore, they found that those who arrived in Toronto or Vancouver were even more likely to stay rather than move. This result is not necessarily surprising, but supports the PNP if the program helps appropriately match immigrants with work in a faster time frame and outside of the big three. Within provinces as according to Beshiri (2004) or across them as according to Akbari (2011), being able to quickly address local labour market needs is therefore necessary for the PNP to be effective.

All of the above illuminated and influenced the design of this study. It supports the PNP as a useful policy tool in theory, but highlights the need for a more in depth empirical analysis to evaluate the program's effectiveness. Although retention is not a major concern for this study since labour market outcomes are not explicitly considered, this a sufficiently large theme in the literature to merit further in depth review. It also highlights the distinction between the demographic and economic rationales for the program. Finally, it also identifies the ways in which it might be deemed successful when judged according to these two rationales. As a

result, this study is structured to consider these two benchmarks separately as much as to consider them in tandem.

3. Methods

This study tests the hypotheses that the PNP has been effective at inducing the arrival of immigrants to smaller Canadian cities or cities in higher labour demand. Let the subscripts *c*, *p*, and *t* respectively denote city, province, and time. The following model is estimated:

$$lnimm_{c,p,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 lnPNP_{p,t} + \beta_2 lnpop_{c,p,t-1} + \beta_3 unemp_{c,p,t} + \beta_4 divRR_{c,p,t} + \mathrm{X}_{c,p,t}\varphi + \varepsilon_{c,p,t} \quad (1)$$

where *lnimm*, the variable of interest, is the natural logarithm of the number of immigrant arrivals. Meanwhile, *lnPNP* is the natural logarithm of successful PNP applications, *lnpop* is the natural logarithm of population, *unemp* is the annual unemployment rate, *divRR* is the relative ratio of ethnic diversity. $\mathrm{X}_{c,p,t}$ is a vector of dummy variables that will be used as controls and regional identifiers. Variables are natural logarithm-transformed where applicable to capture relative rather than absolute effects of immigration on cities of different sizes.

If the assumptions about immigrant behaviour and the PNP are correct, we would expect the $\beta_1, \beta_2, and\ \beta_4$ parameters to be positive while β_3 would be negative. Although Hou (2007), Chui (2003), and Thomas (2011) find that population size itself is less important than commonly assumed in settlement decisions, population is considered here. This is because this study uses macro-level

data, and it is therefore not possible to disaggregate the arrivals to a city or the applications made under the PNP according to particular immigrant groups. Had this been the case, perhaps an analysis similar to theirs would have been conducted and the model altered slightly. But with macro data this study instead considers population levels and diversity, on the assumption that a large and diverse city would be likely to have an immigrant's particular co-ethnic community present, so that β_2 and β_4 are expected to be positive. A higher unemployment rate should signal fewer economic opportunities, provide a disincentive to prospective immigrants, and lead β_3 to be negative. If the PNP is effective at drawing immigrants, higher PNP use by provinces should be associated with more immigrant arrivals to cities in that province, meaning β_1 should be positive.

Ethnic diversity is calculated as relative ratio. This is calculated as the ratio of immigrants to natives in city *c* in year *t-1* to the national ratio. A value of rr>1 means a city is more diverse than nationally and rr<1 means a city is less diverse than nationally. Diversity was calculated this way to avoid simultaneity with immigrant arrivals. This was necessary since the data set includes anyone who was foreign born, rather than not possessing Canadian citizenship or possessing foreign citizenship, as "immigrants". Although other measures of immigration may be possible, this method is supported in the literature (e.g. see Docquier & Schiff (2009)).

Population, diversity, and unemployment were lagged to prevent simultaneity with annual immigrant arrivals. Although immigrant arrivals may appear simultaneous with successful PNP applications, there are several ways this is not the

case. Since the PNP is provincially conducted whereas immigrant arrival is at a city level, from one year to the next and from province to province, the extent to which a province making use of the PNP translates to immigrant arrival in an individual city in that province may change (indeed, this is one of the questions this study hopes to address). Additionally, immigrant arrivals and successful PNP applications are organized by calendar year, so that approval of a PNP application may happen at the end of December only for the applicant to arrive in January. Finally, applicants can be admitted under PNP from inside the country as well as outside the country, and thus may have counted as arriving prior to their admission under the PNP.

Given the differences in Québec's immigration system as defined under the Canada-Québec Accord, a Chow test was performed to detect differences in the effect between Québec and the rest of Canada. This was necessary since the PNP overlaps with the "certificat de sélection du Québec" to a greater extent that the FSW. However, during the time frame of the study Quebec did make several successful PNP applications in multiple years. Although the null hypothesis of the Chow test was rejected, signifying that there may be reason to exclude that subsample, the same test was performed on the other regions and similar results were observed. This was taken as a sign that the Chow test may have picked up effects of different cultural characteristics, language, economic opportunities, geography, etc. rather than necessarily regulatory structure, and since these differences may be present between other regions and are likely also strong influencing factors on immigrant settlement decisions, Québec's observations were included. As a robustness check, the first two base specifications were replicated for

the sub-sample excluding Québec and the size and significance of the coefficients was not materially affected, suggesting that for the sake of completeness, the full national sample ought to be considered.

4. Data

In this paper I use a panel data set that follows 59 Canadian population centres – all 33 Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) and select Census Agglomerations (CAs), hereafter referred to simply as cities - for 12 years (i.e. from 2002 to 2013). Data for this set came from a variety of sources. The estimated population counts for the cities, immigrant arrivals, and the annual unemployment rates were collated from various CANSIM databases accessed through Statistics Canada. The diversity levels were based on the three versions of the census conducted during the time frame (i.e. 2001, 2006, and 2011). Diversity levels for the years 2002-2005 and 2007-2010 were computed by interpolating between census years 2001 and 2006 or 2006 and 2011 respectively, and levels for 2012 and 2013 extrapolated from the 2011 census. Finally, the number of successful PNP applications comes from CIC data obtained via the federal government's Open Data web resource (data.gc.ca).

Given the fact that the PNP is a provincially conducted program, the CMA of Ottawa-Gatineau was considered separately as its Ontario and Québec components. The chosen CAs were included to provide a better picture of immigrant arrival in non-metropolitan cities. The minimum population to be considered a CMA is 100 000 around a central urban area and this excludes several comparatively smaller

cities that are nevertheless important regional centres with populations of several tens of thousands and could be landing points of immigrants. Moreover, given Canada's uneven population distribution, only considering CMAs would lead to over-representation of the major cities of Ontario and Québec. The selected CAs were chosen on the basis of the availability and reliability of the data for the variables of interest. Care was taken to ensure that there was no overlap between cities (e.g. Mississauga not considered separately as it is included in the Toronto CMA) and that the variables were measured using the same city boundaries across time (e.g estimated unemployment figures use Labour Force Survey estimates based on 2006 census boundaries). Table 3, below, presents the included cities.

Table 3: Included cities by region/province

Region/Province	Cities
Atlantic Canada	St. John's, Halifax, Moncton, St. John, Corner Brook, Charlottetown, Cape Breton, Edmunston
Québec	Saguenay, Québec, Sherbrooke, Trois-Rivières, Montréal, Gatineau, Rimouski, Drummondville, Rouyn-Noranda
Ontario	Ottawa, Kingston, Peterborough, Oshawa, Toronto, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Kitchener-Waterloo, Brantford, Guelph, London, Windsor, Barrie, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Cornwall, Belleville, Chatham-Kent, Kawartha Lakes, Sarnia, North Bay
Western Canada	Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Calgary, Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Red Deer, Grande Prairie, Wood Buffalo
BC	Vancouver, Victoria, Abbotsford-Mission, Vernon, Kamloops, Nanaimo, Courtenay-Comox, Prince George

Summary statistics for all included cities in 2002 as well as 2013 are presented in the appendix. In general, cities in Atlantic Canada and Western Canada experienced increases immigrant arrivals from 2002 2013, while cities in Central

Canada have not seen as much of an increase or are effectively stable. PNP admissions greatly increased over the time period. For example, in 2002 Alberta only made 2 successful PNP applications but made 4151 in 2013.

5. Results

After estimating equation (1) with ordinary least squares (OLS), Wooldridge tests confirmed the data featured serial autocorrelation and Cook-Weisberg tests confirmed the data featured heteroskedasticity. This meant that although the parameter estimates may not be biased they are inefficient and their standard errors are biased. To account for this, the model was estimated using a Prais-Winsten transformation; a generalized least squares (GLS) estimation technique.

Five specifications are estimated; the first is the base model estimating the coefficients of only *divRR, lnpop, lnPNP,* and *unemp*. The second specification adds the big three and regional dummy variables, while the third includes interaction terms. These results are presented in Table 4. The fourth specification estimates time effects assuming a linear time trend and also considers interaction terms. The fifth estimates time effects with a flexible time effect using year-specific time dummies with the first year as the reference year observation. These results are presented in Table 5. The results from Table 4 are considered first.

Table 4: Results for base, regional, and regional interaction specifications

	(1) lnimm	(2) lnimm	(3) lnimm
lnPNP	0.014 (1.03)	0.018 (1.60)*	0.265 (1.69)**
lnpop	1.403 (14.69)***	1.225 (14.10)***	1.351 (13.32)***
unemp	-0.035 (3.46)***	-0.033 (3.20)***	-0.038 (1.50)*
divRR	0.790 (3.31)***	1.859 (7.04)***	1.761 (6.92)***
tor		-1.605 (3.22)***	-1.562 (3.30)***
van		-0.923 (1.95)**	-0.719 (1.59)*
mtl		-0.547 (1.30)*	-0.817 (1.88)**
West		0.975 (6.84)***	0.566 (2.27)**
BC		-0.087 (0.53)	-0.388 (0.94)
Atl		0.614 (3.33)***	-0.463 (1.23)
QC		0.938 (4.72)***	0.789 (3.81)***
lnpop•lnPNP			-0.023 (1.90)**
unemp•lnPNP			0.001 (0.21)
QC•lnPNP			0.028 (0.91)
BC•lnPNP			0.057 (0.95)
Atl•lnPNP			0.217 (3.26)***
West•lnPNP			0.074 (2.01)**
constant	-11.112 (10.26)***	-9.952 (10.39)***	-11.263 (9.53)***
R^2	0.83	0.88	0.88
N	638	638	638
D.W. statistic	2.296	2.198	2.216

* $p<0.10$; ** $p<0.05$; *** $p<0.01$ (one-tailed t-test) t statistics in parentheses

For the first specification, *lnpop, unemp,* and *divRR* are generally highly statistically significant, large, and have the expected signs, while *lnPNP* is

statistically insignificant and comparatively small but also has the expected sign. For instance, comparing *lnPNP* with *lnpop*, a city could expect to see a 0.014% increase in immigrant arrivals if it's provincial government makes 1% more successful PNP applications and holding other factors constant, but this is minor compared to the 1.4% increase that same city would see if it's population were 1% larger or the .79% increase that city would see if it were 1% more diverse. The effect of unemployment, at -0.035% for a 1% increase in the city's unemployment rate may appear small, but is twice that of the *lnPNP* estimate and again is statistically significant whereas *lnPNP* is not.

These results would seem to suggest that immigrant arrivals to a city are elastic with respect to population levels, but inelastic with respect to diversity, unemployment, and highly inelastic to PNP use by that city's provincial government. Even with the PNP in place and being actively being used by provinces, this means there is little evidence that a province making use of the PNP in isolation is able to draw immigrants to their cities, at least not relative to the typical draws of population size, economic opportunities, and co-ethnic populations. The regional dummies and interaction terms of the other two specifications lead to more meaningful conclusions that allow us to consider PNP use in conjunction with other variables of interest.

The signs on the "big three" coefficients in the second specification are actually negative rather than positive and rather large in absolute value. After controlling for the base variables, it appears the probability an immigrant will choose Toronto is 160.5% less than the rest of the sample, and similarly 92.3% less for Vancouver and

54.7% less for Montréal. This supports the theory evident in the literature that there is nothing particularly special about Toronto, Montréal, or Vancouver in and of themselves. Instead they receive the most immigrants by virtue of being the largest and most diverse of Canadian cities and are perceived as having good job prospects.

The regional dummies support the notion of regional immigration trends that the PNP could address. Although *BC* is insignificant, *Atl*, *West* and *QC* are mostly highly significant. Since the Toronto variable is also in the controls, all of them show increases in the probability an immigrant will settle in a city in those regions compared to cities Ontario apart from Toronto and after controlling for other variables. Furthermore, since Montréal and Vancouver are also in the controls, the coefficients of *BC* and *QC* represent the draw to cities in these regions apart from Vancouver or Montréal compared to cities in Ontario apart from Toronto. This might be important in the size of the *West* coefficient, which suggests that an immigrant to Canada is 97.5% more likely to choose a non-big three city in Western Canada rather than non-big three cities in the other regions. However, this includes still major cities such as Edmonton, Calgary, and Winnipeg. This might also help explain the small size of the *BC* variable, since after controlling for Vancouver there are not many large cities of comparable size to Edmonton, Calgary, or Winnipeg.

The interaction terms of the third specification add further detail to the picture. The estimate for *lnpop•lnPNP* is statistically significant at the 5% level and decreases the effect of the *lnpop* variable; the net effect is a 1.33% increase in immigrant arrivals for a 1% increase in population. Since this is still a large net effect, but somewhat smaller than in the base model, this is interpreted here as a

sign that the PNP may have induced immigrants to move to the largest cities in the provinces in which they were nominated, even if this was not to the largest cities in the country. Since the largest cities in a province often account for very sizable proportions of a province's overall population, this could explain why there are large effects on population despite immigrants being more inclined to move out of the most populous regions. The estimate for *unemp•lnPNP* is statistically insignificant and considerably small in size. Even if this result was significant, the net result is a 0.037% decrease in immigrant arrivals for a 1% increase in unemployment rate compared to the 0.035% of the base model, suggesting little change in the disincentive effect of a city's unemployment rate when interacted with a province's PNP use.

Also note that the interaction terms of the PNP with the *West* and *Atl* regional dummies exhibit statistical significance while *BC* and *QC* do not. In terms of size of the effects, these coefficients suggest that the PNP is 0.22% more effective at drawing immigrant towards Atlantic Canada and 0.074% more effective in Western Canada than in Ontario, *ceteris paribus*. This is striking in that it does suggest there are provincial or regional variations in the effectiveness of PNP use a factor in immigrant settlement decision. According to the above results the PNP has had negligible effects with regards to cities with low unemployment rates beyond the effect of the unemployment rate in isolation. But it has had some effects to lessen the effect of population size, shifting arrival to cities that may be small nationally but are large provincially. In other words, the PNP has not been able to completely

reverse draws to the large cities, but it has led to a regional dispersal of immigrant arrivals. Table 5 is considered next.

Table 5: Time effects

	(4) lnimm	(5) lnimm		(5 cont.) lnimm
lnPNP	-0.014 (0.49)	-0.064 (1.43)*	t2	-0.114 (2.26)**
lnpop	1.260 (8.15)**	1.251 (8.19)***	t3	0.070 (1.26)
unemp	-0.022 (0.95)	-0.010 (0.43)	t4	0.073 (1.59)*
divRR	1.312 (3.32)***	1.349 (3.45)***	t6	-0.024 (0.42)
QC	0.666 (1.85)**	0.464 (1.21)	t7	-0.076 (0.74)
BC	-0.189 (0.71)	-0.100 (0.35)	t8	-0.137 (0.94)
atl	-0.231 (0.76)	-0.218 (0.71)	t9	-0.035 (0.20)
west	0.417 (1.68)**	0.500 (1.97)**	t10	-0.283 (1.25)
t	0.016 (0.08)	0.002 (0.01)	t11	-0.333 (1.22)
t•QC	-0.001 (0.01)	0.057 (0.98)	t12	-0.520 (1.57)*
t•BC	0.026 (0.84)	0.004 (0.14)		
t•atl	0.101 (2.93)***	0.108 (3.16)***		
t•west	0.088 (3.11)***	0.064 (2.16)***		
t•unemp	-0.002 (0.62)	-0.005 (1.64)**		
t•lnpop	-0.002 (0.10)	-0.001 (0.03)		
t•divRR	-0.001 (0.01)	-0.004 (0.14)		
t•lnPNP	0.002 (0.49)	0.015 (1.99)**		
constant	-9.944 (5.91)**			-9.886 (5.96)**
R^2	0.88			0.88
N	638			638
D.W. statistic	2.228			2.236

* $p<0.10$; ** $p<0.05$; *** $p<0.01$ (one-tailed t test) t statistics in parentheses

t5 dropped to prevent collinearity

The time variable, estimated first as a linear trend in the fourth specification, is important to consider since over the time frame studied several provinces made increased use of the PNP as strict restrictions on their programs were considerably relaxed (see Seidle (2013)). The *t* coefficient, although it is insignificant, implies a 1.6% increase in immigration arrival yearly, although this may have picked up all other contemporaneous changes. The *unemp* coefficient is insignificant, as is its very small interaction term with *t*. This again appears to refute the PNP's ability to attract immigrants to those cities in demand of labour.

The interaction terms with the time variable and the *Atl* and *West* regional dummies are significant and fairly large while those of *BC* and *QC* are not, implying that over time immigrants have shown increased willingness to move to the former regions which cannot be said of the latter. Note that the big three variables have been dropped so these regional dummies and their interaction terms do not only apply to non-big three cities as in table 4. These interaction terms suggest that year-on-year immigrants have shown 10.1% more willingness to settle in Atlantic Canada and 8.8% more willingness to settle in Western Canada. However, we cannot be certain that it is the PNP that accounts for this increase, as the *lnPNP* coefficient uninteracted with time is small, negative, and statistically insignificant while interacted with time it is even smaller and still insignificant, even if it is positive.

The coefficients on the interactions *t•lnpop* and *t•divRR* are also statistically insignificant and small in size. Over time, the effect of these variables appears not to have changed. Intertemporally then, the PNP again appears to have had mixed success from a demographic perspective and less success from an economic

perspective. However, as a robustness check on this measurement of time, year-specific time dummies were also estimated to try and capture any non-linearity in the effect of time. This was necessary since a major recession occurred mid-sample.

In this specification, both *lnPNP* and *t•lnPNP* are now significant. Its size indicates that year-on-year the PNP has become 0.015% more effective at drawing immigrants to a city in a province that makes 1% more successful nominations. This may appear small but considering the size of the *lnPNP* estimate in the first specification was just 0.014% this is actually a striking result. *t•unemp* has also become significant at the 5% level. The size of *t•unemp* suggests a 0.005% decrease in immigrant arrivals year-on-year for a 1% increase in unemployment rate. Again, this appears small but it shows that over time the unemployment rate in a city has become more of a disincentive to immigrant arrival. This is crucial; since the time dummies controlled for non-linearities, the only way these terms would capture contemporaneous changes in the same way they did before the robustness check would be if there were some other equally linear latent variable. So far, no such alternative has been identified. Accordingly, this is arguably evidence that after isolating the linear time trend, increases in the ability of provinces to make use of their PNP over time has led to increased effectiveness of the program from an economic perspective.

Referring to the time dummies, *t6* and *t7* represent 2007 and 2008, the years of the onset of the financial crisis and eventual wider recession. Both coefficients are indeed negative as we might expect. However, they are statistically insignificant, as are most others with the exception of *t2, t4, and t12*. These correspond to 2003,

2005, and 2013. 2003 represents an enlargement of the program is the first year that Alberta and Nova Scotia carried out their PNPs, so that all provinces with exception of Ontario had PNPs in place. 2005 also represents and enlargement of the program since this is the year Ontario signed its agreement, while 2013 saw increases in limits for five provinces.

The PNP is by definition a series of agreements with variations between them. The extent to which any of these years represent structural changes for the program as a whole is not clear – as an example, some provinces saw no increases in 2010 but did see increases in 2013 (e.g. Ontario) while others saw increases in 2010 but did not see increases in 2013 (e.g. New Brunswick). This could, however, merit further research. Perhaps it is worth identifying at what point during the sample or what level of PNP applications provinces were permitted was most crucial in increasing the effectiveness of the program. For the purposes of this study, it is sufficient to conclude that over time the PNP has become more effective as provincial limits were relaxed.

6. Discussion

Taken together, the above results lead to some questions about the exact focus of the PNP even if on the whole they support the PNP in principle. They raise questions about the demographic goals for the program and if they are appropriately defined or if they need to be refined at the very least. They also lead to some (as of yet unanswered) questions about at what point or at what level of use the PNP becomes effective at meeting the economic goals of the program.

The results suggest that there has been regional dispersal of immigrant arrivals. In line with the Carter (2009) and BC Ministry of Tourism, Jobs, and Innovation (2011), it appears that the PNP has induced immigrants to land themselves in Canada outside of the big three cities or Ontario, Québec, and BC to less populated provinces, but still mostly to the metropolitan cities of their nominating province. If the measure of a successful PNP is exclusively to induce more immigrants to settle outside of the big three cities or even the big three provinces, then the PNP passes this test. But if we set a stricter standard of promoting immigration to smaller cities in less populated provinces or smaller cities within populous provinces, the PNP does not pass this test. To use an example, it is as though the PNP has induced immigrants to settle in Saskatoon or Winnipeg rather than Toronto, but not Moose Jaw, Brandon, or even Windsor. By the former standard, the PNP is only really a useful tool for provinces such as Saskatchewan, Manitoba, or Nova Scotia but redundant in the hands of a province such as Ontario. From a federal or national perspective, either is arguably beneficial, but from a provincial perspective there might be differences in opinion as to what constitutes a "more even" distribution of immigrants.

The results, specifically those of the fifth specification, also support anecdotal evidence that the program has been effective from an economic perspective as well, albeit particularly recently as the program has grown. Consider again the assessment of BC (2011) and Akbari (2011), which suggested that an appropriate matching of immigrant skills to local labour markets could promote economic diversification in less populous or economically depressed regions of the country. It

appears that the PNP has been able to do so but this only holds when considering that the program has considerably expanded over the time frame studied, in contrast to the demographic effects which appear relatively consistent throughout. In the first, second, third, and fourth specifications, the deterrent effect of a city's unemployment rate on immigrant settlement decisions appears to be unchanged by the introduction of the PNP. However, in the fifth specification, it appears that immigrants have over time become more willing to move to low-unemployment regions in the country.

As a result of ongoing changes and refinements to the PNP, it may be difficult to identify when the program reached the sufficient scale to be effective from both an economic as well as demographic perspective. Seidle (2013) features an informative discussion of some of these changes. But the PNP is relatively young, and this could perhaps be a subject of further research. At various points through the time studied here, provinces saw fit to alter the requirements of certain streams of their PNP or even scrap some streams entirely. Perhaps in the future, it could be possible to investigate the time or intake levels that constitute structural breaks. Until this is done, this study suffices in illustrating that the PNP has been successful at spreading out immigrant arrivals to less populous regions or provinces in Canada as well as those cities in greater relative labour demand as the program has been progressively implemented and expanded over time.

Conclusion

Canada has historically been an immigrant nation and continues to be a major recipient country of immigrants. However, Canada's expanse and regional diversity has led to a considerably varied immigration landscape. This study has evaluated the effectiveness of the Provincial Nominee Program (PNP), which was conceived in part to address these regionalized trends. Using panel data for select Canadian cities over 12 years during which the PNP was expanded and heavily used, this study investigates changes in the landing points of immigrants to Canada and finds that the PNP has had generally positive results. The PNP has arguably been successful at promoting more immigrant arrival to smaller but still major urban centres throughout the time period studied, and from the most populous provinces to less populous provinces. Given the highly centralized nature of immigration in Canada, this should be considered a success. The PNP was also shown to be successful at matching immigrants to cities in high demand for labour, at least later, after the program was expanded. Likewise, this should also be considered a success. In conclusion, the PNP should therefore be seen as part of the solution to Canada's regionalized immigration trends but not the only solution.

Appendix

Table A1: Summary of data at t=1 (i.e. 2002)

City	Δimm	imm	divRR	PNP	unemp
St. John's	-33	196	0.1506	28	9.2
Halifax	-267	1046	0.3592	0	7.1
Moncton	-54	121	0.1494	41	7.6
Saint John	69	205	0.1993	41	9.4
Saguenay	51	167	0.0601	0	11.1
Quebec	-609	1083	0.1521	0	7.9
Sherbrooke	-124	976	0.2024	0	7.8
Trois-Rivières	83	239	0.0784	0	9.9
Montréal	-3408	30099	0.9576	0	8.3
Ottawa	-1454	5688	1.0884	2	7.2
Gatineau	-13	1064	0.1013	0	6.1
Kingston	-101	385	0.6294	2	6.4
Peterborough	-17	179	0.4238	2	8.5
Oshawa	-88	856	0.8135	2	5.7
Toronto	-36228	86694	2.2649	2	6.3
Hamilton	-1115	3318	1.2209	2	6.2
St. Catharines	-138	966	0.9169	2	6.3
Kitchener-Waterloo	-841	2429	1.1416	2	6.2
Brantford	2	243	0.5132	2	6.8
Guelph	-233	555	0.9627	2	4.9
London	-1016	1873	0.9654	2	6.4
Windsor	-1192	2211	1.15	2	6.8
Barrie	-19	242	0.5976	2	5.8
Sudbury	47	176	0.363	2	8.9
Thunder Bay	61	165	0.5717	2	8.2
Winnipeg	179	3758	0.8551	576	5.2
Regina	-34	450	0.3869	20	5.5
Saskatoon	-222	626	0.2766	20	6.2
Calgary	-1667	8043	1.0982	2	4.6
Edmonton	-838	3551	0.934	2	5
Kelowna	-69	207	0.7139	76	6.5
Abbotsford-Mission	-70	685	1.1188	76	6.8
Vancouver	-5785	28673	1.9366	76	6.6
Victoria	-146	676	0.9616	76	6.3
Corner Brook	3	3	0.0601	28	10.2
Charlottetown	-40	74	0.1654	8	7.9
Cape Breton	6	33	0.0863	0	19.1
Edmunston	-7	17	0.09	41	10.6

Rimouski	-13	10	0.0433	0	5.8
Drummondville	36	174	0.0746	0	10.9
Rouyn-Noranda	7	16	0.0607	0	13.8
Cornwall	69	69	0.1738	2	6.7
Belleville	-52	114	0.3062	2	6.6
Chatham-Kent	-38	238	0.4611	2	8.8
Kawartha Lakes	-8	69	0.4346	2	5.5
Sarnia	-112	182	0.4596	2	8.2
North Bay	5	83	0.1998	2	7.7
Brandon	-31	84	0.1932	576	4.7
Moose Jaw	20	170	0.1713	20	5.6
Medicine Hat	-80	116	0.363	2	4.8*
Lethbridge	-136	324	0.312	2	5.4
Red Deer	-95	198	0.1994	2	5.9
Grande Prairie	3	64	0.155	2	4.8
Wood Buffalo	24	125	0.4334	2	5.2*
Vernon	47	109	0.4589	76	8.9
Kamloops	-12	93	0.3849	76	13.8
Nanaimo	5	177	0.5367	76	12.7
Courtenay-Comox	4	44	0.5658	76	11.4
Prince George	60	127	0.456	76	9.6

Note: * = first reported observation for unemployment rates

Table A2: Summary Statistics at t=12 (i.e. 2013)

City	Δimm	imm	divRR	PNP	unemp
St. John's	-38	443	0.1401	297	7.2
Halifax	-87	1710	0.3786	745	6.1
Moncton	-87	744	0.2137	570	6.8
Saint John	-49	391	0.2033	570	8.7
Saguenay	2	76	0.051	0	7.6
Quebec	102	3357	0.2096	0	5.1
Sherbrooke	27	1232	0.289	0	7.5
Trois-Rivières	12	410	0.1321	0	7.9
Montréal	1400	46217	1.0604	0	8.5
Ottawa	262	6124	1.019	1580	6.1
Gatineau	52	1745	0.5003	0	6.2
Kingston	16	369	0.5217	1580	6.7
Peterborough	6	160	0.3619	1580	8.2
Oshawa	34	827	0.7286	1580	8.7
Toronto	3484	81236	2.0566	1580	8.6
Hamilton	148	3483	1.0685	1580	6.5
St. Catharines	40	987	0.7523	1580	7.8

Kitchener-Waterloo	135	3059	1.059	1580	6.6
Brantford	10	241	0.5106	1580	8.4
Guelph	33	807	0.9052	1580	5.5
London	106	2467	0.8531	1580	8.6
Windsor	97	2315	1.0086	1580	9.8
Barrie	14	322	0.5493	1580	8.3
Sudbury	7	163	0.2802	1580	6.9
Thunder Bay	4	83	0.4057	1580	5.4
Winnipeg	-2097	10944	0.9661	4260	5.5
Regina	-587	3515	0.4946	4469	4.1
Saskatoon	-729	4367	0.5001	4469	5.6
Calgary	1118	18316	1.1994	4151	4.7
Edmonton	753	12257	0.9323	4151	5.7
Kelowna	-6	353	0.6372	4359	6.8
Abbotsford-Mission	-20	1230	1.0735	4359	7.9
Vancouver	-467	31010	1.8567	4359	6.7
Victoria	-15	981	0.8083	4359	5.4
Corner Brook	-2	33	0.0749	297	15.7
Charlottetown	-487	813	0.41715	479	8.3
Cape Breton	-2	39	0.0888	745	14
Edmunston	-2	11	0.0988	570	8.5
Rimouski	2	41	0.7848	0	7.3*
Drummondville	7	214	0.1116	0	9.9
Rouyn-Noranda	1	20	0.0511	0	5.5
Cornwall	5	108	0.199	1580	6.8
Belleville	7	152	0.2105	1580	7.7
Chatham-Kent	5	124	0.3743	1580	9.4
Kawartha Lakes	3	36	0.351	1580	7.5
Sarnia	6	149	0.3422	1580	8.9
North Bay	2	62	0.184	1580	7.5
Brandon	-83	437	0.503	4260	5.1
Moose Jaw	-26	154	0.19	4469	7.1
Medicine Hat	17	294	0.3006	4151	5.6*
Lethbridge	115	1796	0.3718	4151	6.1
Red Deer	56	883	0.2319	4151	5.2
Grande Prairie	18	298	0.1445	4151	5.7*
Wood Buffalo	42	661	0.7302	4151	4.6
Vernon	-1	104	0.3944	4359	8.8
Kamloops	-3	152	0.316	4359	7.2
Nanaimo	-3	265	0.4291	4359	5
Courtenay-Comox	-1	65	0.5168	4359	7.6*
Prince George	-1	81	0.4026	4359	6.3

Note: * = last reported observation for unemployment rates

References

Abbott, M.G. & Beach, C.M. (2011). "Do admission criteria and economic recessions affect immigrant earnings?" Montréal, Que.: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Akbari, A.H. (2011). "Labor market performance of immigrants in smaller regions of western countries: Some evidence from Atlantic Canada." *International Migration and Integration* v12, 133-154.

Alasia, A. & Magnusson, E. (2005). "Occupational skill level: The divide between rural and urban Canada." *Rural and Small Town Canada Analysis Bulletin* v6 (no2).

Aydemir, A. (2003). "Effects of business cycles on the labour market participation and employment rate assimilation of immigrants." *Statistics Canada Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper Series*. No. 203.

British Columbia Ministry of Jobs, Tourism, and Innovation. (2011). "BC Provincial Nominee Program evaluation report." Retrieved from http://celarc.ca/cppc/230/230568.pdf

Borjas, G. J. (2006). "Native internal migration and the labor market impact of immigration." *Journal of Human Resources* v41(no2), 221-258.

Borjas, G.J. (2014). *Immigration Economics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. As cited in Boudarbat, B., & Grenier, G. (2014) "L'impact de l'immigration sur la dynamique économique du Québec: Rapport remis au ministère de l'Immigration, de la Diversité et de l'Inclusion"

Bourgeois, A., Debus, A., George, B., Habelsma, J., Kelly, D. Langford, J. & Lavoie, A. (2006). "Immigration and small business: Ideas to better respond to Canada's skills and labour shortage." Willowdale, Ont.: Canadian Federation of Independent Business.

Bélanger, A. & Malenfant, E.C. (2005). "Ethnocultural diversity in Canada: prospects for 2017." *Canadian Social Trends*. (Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 11-008)

Beshiri, R. (2004). "Immigrants in rural Canada: 2001 update." *Rural and Small Town Canada Analysis Bulletin* v5(no4).

Carter, T. (2009). "An evaluation of the Manitoba Provincial Nominee Program", prepared for Manitoba Labour and Immigration Division. Retrieved from http://www.gov.mb.ca/labour/immigration/pdf/pnp-manitoba-provincial-nominee-program-tom-carter-report-2009.pdf

Chui, T. (2003). "Longitudinal survey of immigrants to Canada: Process, progress and prospects". Catalogue No. 89-611-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2011). "Evaluation of the Provincial Nominee Program". Retrieved from http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2012/cic/Ci4-75-2011-eng.pdf

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2013a). *Permanent and Temporary Residents by Category and Year.* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://data.gc.ca/data/en/dataset/17b4a2d0-86d1-491c-b733-429bd31492ee

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2013b). *Backgrounder – Provincial Nominee Program*. Retrieved from http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/backgrounders/2013/2013-10-28a.asp

Docquier, F. & Schiff, M. (2009) "Measuring skilled migration rates: The case of small states." The World Bank Development Research Group Policy Research Working Paper 4827.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities (2009). "Immigration and diversity in Canadian cities and communities." Retrieved from http://www.fcm.ca/Documents/backgrounders/Immigration_and_Diversity_in_Canadian_Cities_and_Communities_EN.pdf

Grenier, G., & Xue, L. (2011). "Canadian immigrants' access to a first job in their intended occupation." *International Migration and Integration* v12, 275-303.

Gross, D. & Schmitt, N. (2009). "Temporary foreign workers and regional labour market disparities in Canada." Metropolis British Columbia Working Paper Series, no. 09-05.

Hou, F. (2007). "Changes in the initial destinations and redistribution of Canada's

major immigrant groups: Re-examining the role of group affinity." *International Migration Review* v41(no3), 680–705.

House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration. (2003). The Provincial Nominee Program : a partnership to attract immigrants to all parts of Canada : report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration / Joe Fontana, chair.

Kelly, P., Park, S. & Akbar, M. (2011). "Profile of Provincial Nominee Program (PNP) immigrants to Canada, 1996-2009." Toronto Immigrant Employment Data Initiative Analytical Report 26.

Kustec, S. (2012). "The role of migrant labour supply in the Canadian labour market." Retrieved from http://books.scholarsportal.info/viewdoc.html?id=560631

Metropolis Project Canada (2006). "Selection of economic immigrants and alignment with labour market needs." Retrieved from http://books.scholarsportal.info/viewdoc.html?id=527812

Ostrovsky, Y., Hou, F., & Picot, W.G. (2008). "Internal migration of immigrants: Do immigrants respond to regional labour demand shocks?" Statistics Canada Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper (Catalogue no. 11F0019M – no. 318).

Pandey, M. & Townsend, J. (2011). "Provincial Nominee Programs: An evaluation of The earnings and retention rates of nominees." Edmonton, Alta.: Prairie Metropolis Centre.

Rebhun, U. (2003). "The changing roles of human capital, state context of residence, and ethnic bonds in interstate migration: American Jews 1970-1990." International Journal of Population Geography v9, 3-21.

Reitz, J.G. (2012). "The distinctiveness of Canadian immigration experience." Patterns of Prejudice, v46 (no5), 518 – 538.

Saskatchewan Labour Market Commission (2009). "Right people, right place, right time: Saskatchewan's labour market strategy."

Seidle, F.L. (2013). "Canada's Provincial Nominee Immigration Programs: Securing greater policy agreement." Montréal, Que.: Institute for Research on Public

Policy Study no. 43.

Statistics Canada. Table 051-0056. "Estimates of population by census metropolitan area, sex and age group for July 1, based on the Standard Geographical Classification (SGC) 2011, annual (persons)", CANSIM (database). (accessed: 2014-09-23)

Statistics Canada. Table 051-0057. "Components of population growth by census metropolitan area, sex and age group for the period from July 1 to June 30, based on the Standard Geographical Classification (SGC) 2011, annual (persons)", CANSIM (database). (accessed: 2014-09-23)

Statistics Canada. Table 051-0062. "Estimates of population by census division, sex and age group for July 1, based on the Standard Geographical Classification (SGC) 2011, annual (persons)", CANSIM (database). (accessed: 2014-09-23)

Statistics Canada. Table 051-0063. "Components of population growth by census division, sex and age group for the period from July 1 to June 30, based on the Standard Geographical Classification (SGC) 2011, annual (persons)", CANSIM (database). (accessed: 2014-09-23)

Statistics Canada. Table 282-0110. "Labour force survey estimates (LFS), by census metropolitan area based on 2006 census boundaries, sex and age group, annual (persons unless otherwise noted)", CANSIM (database). (accessed: 2014-09-23)

Statistics Canada. Table 282-0115. "Labour force survey estimates (LFS), by selected census agglomerations based on 2006 census boundaries, annual (persons unless otherwise noted)", CANSIM (database). (accessed: 2014-09 -23)

Statistics Canada. (2006). "Population by immigrant status and period of immigration, percentage distribution (2006), for Canada and census metropolitan areas and census agglomerations." [Archived Census Data file].

Statistics Canada (2010). "Population projections for Canada, the Provinces and Territories: 2009 to 2036." (Catalogue no. 91-520-X)

Statistics Canada (2014). "Population projections for Canada, the Provinces and Territories, 2013 to 2063." *The Daily, Wednesday September 17, 2014.*

Thomas, D. (2011). "Personal networks and economic adjustment of immigrants." Canadian Social Trends (component of Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 11 -008-X)

van der Waal, J. (2011). "Post-industrialisation, immigration and unemployment: How and why the impact of immigration on unemployment Differences between Dutch Cities". *Urban Studies* v49(no8), 1711-1724.

Xu, L. (2007). "Inter-CMA migration of the immigrants in Canada: 1991–1996 and 1996–2001". *Social and Economic Dimensions of an Aging Population (SEDAP) Research Paper No. 195*. Hamilton: McMaster University.

Xu, L. & Liaw, K. (2007). "Initial destination choices of skilled-worker immigrants from South Asia to Canada: Assessment of the relative importance of explanatory factors." *Social and Economic Dimensions of an Aging Population (SEDAP) Research Paper No. 193.* Hamilton: McMaster University.

Yukon Department of Education. (2010). "Labour market framework for Yukon: Immigration strategy."