



The World Economy / Volume 42, Issue 12 / p. 3488-3514

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Putting Canada in the penalty box: Trade and welfare effects of eliminating North American Free Trade Agreement

Scott L. Baier , Jeffrey H. Bergstrand, John P. Bruno

First published: 03 October 2019

<https://doi.org/10.1111/twec.12870>

Citations: 7

Abstract

Three years ago, very few economists would have imagined that one of the newest and fastest growing research areas in international trade is the use of quantitative trade models to estimate the economic welfare losses from *dissolutions* of major countries' economic integration agreements (EIAs). In 2016, "Brexit" was passed in a UK referendum. Moreover, in 2019, the existence of the entire North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) is at risk if the US withdraws—a threat President Trump has made if the proposed US–Mexico–Canada Agreement is not passed by the US Congress. We use state-of-the-art econometric methodology to estimate the partial (average treatment) effects on international trade flows of the six major types of EIAs. Armed with precise estimates of the average treatment effect for a free trade agreement, we examine the general equilibrium trade and welfare effects of the elimination of NAFTA (and for robustness US withdrawal only). Although all the member countries' standards of living fall, surprisingly the smallest economy, Mexico, is not the biggest loser; Canada is the biggest loser. Canada's welfare (per capita income) loss of 2.11% is nearly *two times* that of Mexico's loss of 1.15% and is nearly *eight times* the US' loss of 0.27%. The simulations will illustrate the important influence of trade costs—international *and intranational*—in contributing to the gains (or losses) from an EIA's formation (or elimination).

REFERENCES

Anderson, J., & van Wincoop, E. (2003). Gravity with Gravitas: A solution to the border puzzle. *American Economic Review*, 93(1), 170–192.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Arkolakis, C., Costinot, A., & Rodriguez-Clare, A. (2012). New trade models, same old gains? *American Economic Review*, 102(1), 94–130.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Baier, S., & Bergstrand, J. (2001). The growth of world trade: Tariffs, transport costs, and income similarity. *Journal of International Economics*, 53(1), 1–27.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Baier, S., & Bergstrand, J. (2007). Do free trade agreements actually increase members' international trade? *Journal of International Economics*, 71(1), 72–95.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Baier, S., & Bergstrand, J. (2009). *Bonus vetus* OLS: A simple method for approximating international trade-cost effects using the gravity equation. *Journal of International Economics*, 77(1), 77–85.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Baier, S., Bergstrand, J., & Clance, M. (2018). Heterogeneous effects of economic integration agreements. *Journal of Development Economics*, 135, 587–608.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Baier, S., Bergstrand, J., Egger, P., & McLaughlin, P. (2008). Do economic integration agreements actually work? Issues in understanding the causes and consequences of the growth of regionalism. *The World Economy*, 31(4), 461–497.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Baier, S., Bergstrand, J., & Feng, M. (2014). Economic integration agreements and the margins of international trade. *Journal of International Economics*, 93(2), 339–350.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Baier, S., Bergstrand, J., & Vidal, E. (2007). Free trade agreement in the Americas: Are the trade effects larger than anticipated? *The World Economy*, 30(9), 1347–1377.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Baier, S., Kerr, A., & Yotov, Y. (2018). Gravity, distance, and international trade. In W. Wesley, & B. Blonigen (Eds.), *Handbook of international trade and transportation* (pp. 15–78). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

[Google Scholar](#)

Bergstrand, J., & Egger, P. (2011). Gravity equations and economic frictions in the world economy. In D. Bernhofen, R. Falvey, D. Greenaway, & U. Kreickemeier (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of international trade* (pp. 532–570). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Bergstrand, J., Larch, M., & Yotov, Y. (2015). Economic integration agreements, border effects, and distance elasticities in the gravity equation. *European Economic Review*, 78, 307–327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecore.v.2015.06.003>

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Brakman, S., Garretsen, H., & Kohl, T. (2017). *Consequences of Brexit and options for a global Britain* (Cesifo Working Papers). Retrieved from <https://www.cesifo.org/en/publikationen/2017/workingpaper/consequence-s-brexite-and-options-global-britain>

[Google Scholar](#)

Chaney, T. (2008). Distorted gravity: The intensive and extensive margins of international trade. *American Economic Review*, 98(4), 1707–1721. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.98.4.1707>

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Cheng, I., & Wall, H. (2005). Controlling for heterogeneity in gravity models of trade and integration. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, 87(1), 49–63. <https://doi.org/10.20955/r.87.49-64>

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Costinot, A., & Rodriguez-Clare, A. (2014). Trade theory with numbers. In G. Gopinath, E. Helpman, & K. Rogoff (Eds.), *Handbook of international economics* (pp. 197–261, Vol. 4). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier.

[Google Scholar](#)

Eaton, J., & Kortum, S. (2002). Technology, geography and trade. *Econometrica*, 70(5), 1741–1779. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0262.00352>

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Egger, P., Larch, M., Staub, K., & Winkelmann, R. (2011). The trade effects of endogenous preferential trade agreements. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 3(3), 113–143. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.3.3.113>

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Head, K., & Mayer, T. (2014). Gravity equations: Workhorse, toolkit, and cookbook. In G. Gopinath, E. Helpman, & K. Rogoff (Eds.), *Handbook of international economics* (pp. 131–195, Vol. 4). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier.

[Google Scholar](#)

Helpman, E., Melitz, M., & Rubinstein, Y. (2008). Trading partners and trading volumes. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(2), 441–487.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Mayer, T., Vicard, V., & Zignago, S. (2018). *The cost of non-Europe revisited* (Banque de France Working Papers). Retrieved from <https://publications.banque-france.fr/en/cost-non-europe-revisited>

[Google Scholar](#)

Oberhofer, H., & Pfaffermayr, M. (2017). *Estimating the trade and welfare effects of Brexit: A panel data structural gravity approach* (CESifo. Working Papers). Retrieved from <https://www.cesifo.org/en/publikationen/2017/working-paper/estimating-trade-and-welfare-effectsbrexit-panel-data-structural>

[Google Scholar](#)

Tinbergen, J. (1962). *Shaping the world economy: Suggestions for an international economic policy*. New York, NY: The Twentieth Century Fund.

[Google Scholar](#)

Trefler, D. (2004). The long and short of the Canada-US Free Trade Agreement. *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 870–895. <https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828042002633>

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Wooldridge, J. (2000). *Introductory econometrics*. Chicago, IL: South-Western.

[Google Scholar](#)

Citing Literature



[Download PDF](#)

ABOUT WILEY ONLINE LIBRARY

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Terms of Use](#)

[About Cookies](#)

[Manage Cookies](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Wiley Research DE&I Statement and Publishing Policies](#)

[Developing World Access](#)

HELP & SUPPORT

[Contact Us](#)

[Training and Support](#)

DMCA & Reporting Piracy

OPPORTUNITIES

Subscription Agents
Advertisers & Corporate Partners

CONNECT WITH WILEY

The Wiley Network
Wiley Press Room

Copyright © 1999-2024 John Wiley & Sons, Inc or related companies. All rights reserved, including rights for text and data mining and training of artificial intelligence technologies or similar technologies.

WILEY