

The Impact of Immigrants on Low-Wage Earners: The Case Study Research

Case study research on the impacts of low-wage immigrants is distinguished from other approaches by its local focus and by its eclectic methods. Case study researchers investigate the influence of immigrants on a circumscribed environment and normally study the role of immigrants in one industrial sector in one location at a time. The most distinguishing characteristic of this research is its reliance on in-depth interviews with all parties involved, including the employed immigrants, similarly employed U.S. workers, employers, participants in ancillary activities, trade unions, and employer associations. Usually the work uses quotes from the economic actors to highlight its points.¹

The case study approach suffers from many limitations. Its main problem is the difficulty of generalizing findings to a societywide level from individual cases.² Also, competition among groups participating in a sector is easier to observe in a case study while complementary interactions may be hidden because they occur throughout a community. It is hard to determine with precision who gains and loses as a result of immigrant incorporation into the studied labor market because researchers normally cannot follow up on those who depart the subsector of employment. The only certain losers are observed workers who stay behind at depressed conditions after immigrants enter a labor market. Nor can case studies usually identify the ripple effects beyond the sector under study. Even in cases where wage depression can be unequivocally demonstrated within a sector, the impact on other participants outside the immediate labor market is not clear. Impacts on workers in ancillary occupations who are affected by the production level and costs of the sector under study (for example, wholesalers, packers, and truck drivers associated with the production of fruits) are not usually adequately reported by the case studies.

On the other hand, case studies have many advantages in studying immigrant impacts on low-wage sectors. The mechanisms of group interaction and processes of incorporation can be probed by talking to the actual participants, who can explain from their point of view the role of immigrants in the evolution of the sectoral labor market. These interested parties can identify with precision the mechanisms of ethnic replacement and succession, and they provide insight into what actions resulted in some groups benefiting while others did not. The researcher, of course, must be able to balance the often contrasting views of people with distinct interests in order to leave readers with a balanced perspective (Waldinger, 1996).

One unique advantage of this close-up, fine-grained approach is that powerful hypotheses emerge, which help analyze the impacts of immigrants on low-wage sectors. The first step is to be conversant with these hypotheses if the case study approach is to be beneficial. The hypotheses focus on the basic issue of this chapter: whether or not, with all else being equal, immigrants have a negative or positive effect on the principal groups at risk (that is, low-skilled Americans and previously arrived legal immigrants). This chapter begins with a hypothesis that stresses the positive or neutral role of immigrants and then turns to one that focuses on the more negative side.

¹ There are four main sources of these case studies. The University of California at San Diego, Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, did a series of case studies in its Government Interventions Project in 1982-1985. Roger Waldinger and Thomas Bailey studied various sectors in New York City throughout the 1980's; Waldinger has continued doing case studies in Los Angeles in the 1990's. The Commission on Agricultural Workers sponsored a series of case studies on farmworkers in 1992. And, finally the U.S. Department of Labor's International Labor Affairs Bureau sponsored industrial sector case studies in the 1987-1988 period. Many of them are summarized in U.S. General Accounting Office (1988) and U.S. Department of Labor (1989).

² A case study can pinpoint a negatively affected group such as unskilled black janitors in Los Angeles. However, it cannot tell if immigration's overall effect on blacks in Los Angeles was negative. Any economic expansion that may have resulted from immigration could have indirectly opened up many public service jobs (which are often barred to immigrants) for blacks.

Hypotheses on Immigrants and Low-Wage Sectors

The Successive Ethnic Niche Hypothesis³

First, under this proposition, there is not direct substitutability between immigrants and natives. Although foreign and domestic labor groups may share some common traits—for example, their low skill level—differences in their expectations and work objectives outweigh these apparent similarities. Second, the newcomers do not usually drive native workers out of the labor market, but rather, they enter as the natives move up to better jobs. Through ethnic succession, the immigrants replace earlier immigrant groups who are voluntarily departing. Third, some immigrant groups establish potent ethnic markets through the development of culture-specific autonomous ethnic enclaves or by forming subgroups in the open economy.

For some groups within these economic enclaves and subgroups, both entry and the acquisition of skills are largely restricted to coethnics. The immigrant groups under this model are socially closed and complete: Families immigrate with adequate numbers of “leadership” individuals possessing human and financial capital. These better-off individuals in the ethnic group form an entrepreneurial elite that hires later arriving coethnics and provides them with skills. This process allows unskilled members of immigrant ethnic groups to achieve occupational mobility and form small firms of their own.⁴

Under this model, when long-resident ethnic groups such as Irish, Italians, and Jews leave low-wage job slots, the new immigrant groups succeed in filling the openings. However, this immigrant incorporation does not constitute a displacement of groups of native Americans because these latter groups either were never dominant in, or voluntarily departed from, the now immigrant-reliant sectors.

The Successive Ethnic Displacement Hypothesis⁵

Under this model, labor markets are undermined by successive waves of newcomers. The ethnic groups in this situation are better characterized as job-seeking networks dependent on the larger overall labor market than as self-sufficient groups that provide newcomers opportunities for learning skills and opening small businesses. The community networks are not complete groups that include members with high skills and financial resources. Rather, they are truncated networks consisting of predominantly unskilled, poor immigrants in which solo males are a significant and constantly replenished subgroup.⁶ Moreover, the networks are often transnational in character. For example, a large proportion of farmworkers who do seasonal jobs go back and forth to the United States from their foreign base or home community.⁷

Often the larger economy uses middlemen of the same ethnic group to mediate the transactions with the unskilled newcomers. Individual sending communities mature over time, first sending male pioneers to the United States. After time, some of these earlier arrivals get decent jobs, bring their families, and set up settlement communities. The settled family migrants, although their skill levels remain low, have more familiarity with U.S. labor customs than the recently arrived migrants. As a result, over time the settled immigrants make demands on employers to improve wages and working conditions. But these demands often backfire on the settled immigrants because the ethnic middlemen have access to more recently arrived migrants whom they use to replace the incumbent workers.

³ The contributors to this formulation are Roger Waldinger (1996), Thomas Bailey (1987), and Alejandro Portes and Robert Bach (1985).

⁴ The best examples of these successful ethnic niches are Jews, Japanese, Cubans, and recently Koreans (Portes and Bach, 1985:268).

⁵ This hypothesis can be found in Zabin et al. (1993:91), Mines and Avina (1992), and Mines and Anzaldúa (1982). The national groups most closely associated with this type of network are Mexicans and Salvadorans.

⁶ In agriculture, one of the sectors most cited by the proponents of this model, about 64 percent of the workers are unaccompanied workers (U.S. DOL's National Agricultural Workers Survey).

⁷ About 46 percent of foreign-born farmworkers return abroad each year (Gabbard et al., 1994:17).

Evidence for Hypotheses on Immigrants and Low-Wage Sectors

Evidence for the Successive Ethnic Niche Hypothesis

Thomas Bailey and Roger Waldinger conducted a series of case studies in the 1980's in New York City that provide support for the first hypothesis of successive ethnic niches. Despite appearances to the contrary,⁸ African-American New Yorkers were not displaced by foreigners. Waldinger demonstrates clearly that the white ethnic groups in New York City who left low-skilled employment in the period after 1950, and especially after 1970, did so voluntarily (Waldinger, 1996:93). Although the low-wage sectors shrank somewhat as education requirements for employment increased and industries left the inner city, the demand for low-skilled workers remained strong in New York City. However, in the manufacturing sector, construction, hotels, and restaurants—where the immigrants entered in large numbers—blacks had never had a large presence. As a result, there was no direct displacement of blacks, just the replacement of whites.

Waldinger presents evidence that the main barrier to blacks becoming the replacement group instead of the immigrants was the lack of upwardly mobile jobs in these sectors.⁹ According to Waldinger, opportunity for upward mobility would have drawn blacks into these sectors; however, African Americans, as second- and third-generation immigrants from the South, were not interested in essentially dead-end menial jobs. In the garment industry, the unions and incumbent workers of white ethnic groups made it difficult for African Americans to gain access to the skilled positions (Waldinger, 1996:108). In construction, despite extensive protest and pressure, trade unionists were able to keep African Americans away from most of the skilled trades. Finally, in hotels and restaurants, the front-of-the-house jobs (like waiters and receptionists) which often lead to skill acquisition opportunities, were difficult for African Americans to obtain. While blocked from numerous upwardly mobile private-sector jobs, many blacks, especially the educated, began to build their own labor market niches in government and large companies. Similarly, many of the low-paid immigrants established ethnic niches and advanced as a group through skill acquisition and small business activity.¹⁰

Waldinger (1992) compares hotel workers in Philadelphia, a city with a low concentration of immigrants, with New York City where immigrants are numerous. Despite there being a greater presence of immigrants in the hotel industry in New York City, hotel wages in that city are higher. This demonstrates that the presence of immigrants by itself may not have a negative impact on wages. Moreover, immigrant hotel workers in New York have not been limited to the menial tasks, but have moved up in a hotel environment that has allowed them to refer their coethnics to better job slots.¹¹

Meanwhile, the native minority workers have not broken the barriers to upward mobility in the industry. Waldinger identifies discrimination as a contributing factor. In his surveys of hotel managers, he finds that they tend to stereotype African Americans and demonstrate a preference for immigrants. Moreover, front-of-the-house jobs tend to be monopolized by whites. Hotels actively recruit in colleges to fill these positions. At best, African Americans find themselves competing against immigrants for jobs in the lower-wage, less prestigious back-of-the-house management slots. For all these reasons, native minority workers, seeing no

⁸ The immigrants took over many of the niches in low-wage employment in New York City at a time when black employment, especially for the unskilled, was dropping. Native African-American employment in New York City for men aged 25-64 fell from 81 percent to 66 percent between 1970 and 1990 according to the Census (Waldinger, 1996:54).

⁹ The arguments regarding the reasons that African-Americans did not occupy the economic niches being vacated by whites (which are principally attributed to anti-black discrimination) are developed in Waldinger's recent book (Waldinger, 1996). These arguments were not part of the original hypothesis developed by Waldinger and Bailey in the 1980's and are not a necessary part of the successive ethnic niche hypothesis presented here.

¹⁰ In the 1970's and 1980's, overall garment production in New York City fell, while the Chinese manufacturing niche in this sector grew. Small Chinese firms were able to bring skilled opportunities to their coethnics. However, native workers referred by the Employment Service complained that they could not obtain these skilled jobs. The Chinese owners claimed that it was not worth their time to train the natives because they knew they would not last (Waldinger, 1996:265).

¹¹ These include cooks, maitre d's, food service managers, and cleaning managers.

chance for meaningful mobility in the hotel industry, tend not be attracted to entry-level jobs like room cleaners, which are increasingly being occupied by immigrants.

The main difference Waldinger finds between the two cities is a faster exit rate of whites from the hotel industry in New York than in Philadelphia. The need for replacement of these exiting white ethnic workers gave the immigrants their opportunity in New York, of which they took advantage (Waldinger, 1992:112).

Bailey (1987), in a case study on New York City restaurants, presents evidence that immigrants are occupying niches peculiarly suited to them. However, the fast-food industry is an exception because American teenagers can tolerate part-time, short-term employment, thus making good recruits for these enterprises. In fact, this fast expanding sector has absorbed few immigrants while offering many job opportunities to U.S. workers. Furthermore, in the fast food sector, corporations offer chances for job mobility for domestic workers by offering training programs for managers.

On the other hand, in the full service (white tablecloth) and ethnic food sector, the back-of-the-house jobs are dominated by immigrant ethnic workers. Bailey argues that immigrant job objectives are more consistent with the conditions and opportunities in this sector than is the case for domestic workers. The firms are small, and the job ladders are limited. The back-of-the-house workers who begin as dishwashers may have to wait years before a job such as sous-chef becomes available. Moreover, there are limited opportunities for back-of-the-house immigrant workers (and native minorities) to take bartender and waiter jobs that require direct contact with the public.¹² The immigrants, who are often target earners trying to save either to return home or start a business, are willing to tolerate the long and erratic hours of tedious work in the kitchen. Domestic workers who dislike the long hours and the lack of near-term upward mobility believe they have better options than these back-of-the-house jobs. As a result, restaurant owners experience higher turnover rates with domestic workers and develop a preference for immigrants. At the same time, opportunities for advancement for immigrants exist because those immigrants who have the patience to learn the back-of-the-house skills are well positioned to take skilled jobs or open their own restaurant, after they gain several years of experience.¹³

This presentation of the restaurant industry example points out the complementarity of immigrant and domestic workers' labor. According to Bailey, if the supply of immigrants were lessened, there would have to be a shift away from full-service restaurants either to fast food restaurants or to grocery stores. This transition would occur because higher worker turnover would make the full-menu, labor-intensive service more expensive and demand for such service would necessarily decline. Whether such a change benefited fast food establishments or grocery stores, employment for native youth (and some fast food managers) would probably increase. However, employment of front-of-the-house workers in the full-service restaurant, largely well-paid Americans, would decline. In other words, under this scenario, a reduction in immigration would benefit low-wage Americans at the expense of higher-wage Americans.

There is another pair of case studies that tend to give support to the successive ethnic niche hypothesis. The first is the Los Angeles shoe industry. As the white workers in this sector left in the 1950's, a group of skilled shoe workers entered the industry from Guanajuato, Mexico. As a result, the Los Angeles industry was able to maintain its employment level relative to other areas where imports have made greater inroads. However, the wage levels of the workforce fell below that of shoe workers elsewhere in the United States (Runsten, 1985). The second case is the textile industry in Lowell, Massachusetts. This sector began to hire skilled loom fixers from Medellin, Colombia, when the number of domestic artisans in this field dwindled. The skilled Colombians occupied a minority of the slots in the industry but were viewed as vital to its survival (Glassel-Brown, 1988).

¹² This limitation does not apply to immigrants in the ethnic restaurant sector where front-of-the-house jobs sometimes go to coethnics.

¹³ It should be noted that restaurants, especially ethnic ones, absorbed immigrants as the sector expanded. Obviously, no direct displacement of domestic workers occurs in that part of the sector that expanded.

Evidence for the Successive Ethnic Displacement

The critical potential negative impacts of immigrants are displacement of incumbent worker groups from their jobs and wage depression for those who remain in the affected sectors. These negative outcomes sometimes occur as a result of intentional employer actions, while at other times they evolve without a precise employer decision. The most basic approach is for the employer simply to switch from current workers to newcomer networks. Unless the employer speaks the language of the immigrant group, hiring is often done by a bilingual intermediary, either a current employee or a hired middleman. Because the employer is working through the middleman and does not deal directly with the labor force, the employer may not even know that new workers are replacing incumbents.

Another strategy involves immigrant-using low-cost firms underbidding high-cost firms that use a lower proportion of recently immigrated workers. A closely related practice is to subcontract out activity to immigrant-using firms, which leads to the laying off of domestic or incumbent immigrant workers in the primary job-site of the firm. Other firms reorganize their production or technology in a way that tends to exclude or put competitive pressure on U.S. workers. Finally, some firms move geographically to take advantage of low-wage immigrants while others use immigrants to weaken unions. Below, the case study evidence is reviewed to provide historical examples of these practices and the negative outcomes for incumbent workers.

Direct Changing of Networks

The most current case study example of this practice involves Mixtec farmworkers in California and Oregon. The Mixtecs are a minority indigenous non-Spanish-speaking group from the state of Oaxaca, Mexico, who entered the United States in the early 1980's. Because of their lack of education, inability to speak Spanish well, and their ethnic minority status in Mexico, they have come to occupy the bottom rung of the employment ladder in western U.S. agriculture. Estimates have put them at about 10 percent of California farmworkers (Zabin, et al., 1993). The workers being replaced are primarily Mestizos from sending areas in North Central Mexico, whose mother tongue is Spanish.

A case study was held of Mixtec workers in the raisin grape industry of California. The labor force in this crop has several segments. At the bottom are the workers employed by farm labor contractors (FLCs) who sometimes charge for obligatory services such as rides. Above that rung are workers who can get short-term seasonal jobs directly from the grower. Finally, there is full-time work for workers who maintain the vineyards year round.

The Mixtec tend to enter at the lowest rung of the job ladder and many remain there. Evidence from the case study demonstrates that the Mixtec crews are less expensive for the FLC than Mestizo crews. Their labor cost is about 85 percent of that of a Mestizo crew (Zabin, et al., 1993:107). The FLCs who use Mixtecs tend to increase their market share because they can offer the grower the same service for less cost. The result is that the incumbent Mestizo workers lose work. It may be that some of these Mestizos are leaving voluntarily not only because they do not like the depressed wages but also because they have better alternatives. However, growers studied by the case study researchers were turning to direct hires of Mixtecs (without intermediaries). The study provides proof of the direct layoff of Mestizos to make room for the less costly Mixtecs. The study observes that the Mixtecs "have driven the Mestizo workers out of the market" (Zabin et al, 1993:113).

The story of group displacement in California agriculture is not unique to Mixtecs in the raisin grape harvest. Another case of clear displacement occurred among tomato pickers in San Diego County in the early 1980's. A group of unionized legal border crossers who lived in Tijuana picked the "fresh market" tomato crop for many years in San Diego County. They were making \$4.00 per hour by 1980. However, in the early 1980's, growers switched to an unauthorized crew of workers and lowered the wage to \$3.35 (Nalven and Fredrickson, 1982; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1988:38). Almost all the veteran workers who were unwilling to work at the reduced rate disappeared from San Diego County's tomato fields.

There are many other examples of switching to newcomer workers in agriculture from the case study literature. Hispanic migrants have replaced the native African-American peach workers in South Carolina and Georgia. Usually, the newcomer migrants take over the harvest tasks first and only later replace the native workers in the preharvest and packing shed jobs (Amendola, et al., 1993). The same phenomenon also has occurred in Michigan where recent Mexican immigrants have replaced incumbent migrant workers from Texas (Kissam and Garcia, 1993). Although there is no proof from these case studies that incumbent workers were forced out of farmwork for they may have been departing for reasons unrelated to the new entrants, accounts of stagnant wages and surplus labor of newcomers were reported in 9 out of 10 case studies conducted for the Commission on Agricultural Workers (1993). These conditions may contribute to native workers' decisions to leave these labor markets.

The Underbidding of Competitors and the Use of Subcontractors

The organized janitorial workers of Los Angeles had achieved favorable Service Employees International Union (SEIU) contracts by the early 1980's. The labor force in the downtown high-rise office buildings was a stable group of native African Americans who were paid \$12 per hour, including benefits. At that time, new firms were formed that hired a labor force of new arrivals from Mexico and El Salvador and paid these newcomers the then minimum wage of \$3.35 per hour. Because janitorial work does not require much training, employers were able to reorganize the work by using roaming crews of workers rather than the previous system of stationing janitors in each building. This new labor process was made possible because the new migrants provided an ample and easily replenishable workforce that accepted these much lower wages and less desirable working conditions.

Some of these new firms were run by the previous managers of the unionized firms who were familiar with the required level of service and had contacts with the building managers. In a period of 2 years, the union firms had been displaced by the new firms. The incumbent native-born workers lost their jobs as recent immigrants filled those positions. The going wage for janitors in the large office buildings had been reduced to a fraction of what it was before (Mines and Avina, 1992). The displaced African Americans did not find other work. According to a black business representative, "a very small percentage of these worker(s) have found jobs. They are unskilled people; they don't know anything but janitorial..." (Mines and Avina, 1992:440).

A similar scenario occurred in Ventura County citrus in the late 1970's and early 1980's. A group of harvesting associations had, since the end of the Bracero Program in 1965, opted for a stabilized Mexican labor force. In effect, the associations legalized the former Mexican Bracero workers and their relatives. The settled workers, after adapting to life in the United States, grew to expect improved conditions and eventually became protected by a union contract. But, after conditions improved for the workers, alternatives to the grower associations began to appear in the form of FLCs using recently arrived immigrants. In the space of a couple of years, the grower associations had dissolved themselves, and the union lost all its contracts. The workers either worked for the new contractors with greatly reduced wages and benefits or they left the industry (Mines and Anzaldúa, 1982).

In a more recent example, Los Angeles hospitals have been switching to subcontractors to do janitorial tasks (Lichter and Waldinger, 1996). African Americans make up many of the regular hospital employees who are being put at risk by this development. The subcontractors are paying \$4.50 per hour instead of the \$7.90 going rate for in-house workers. "The result is the likely replacement of many long-term hospital workers, especially African Americans" (Lichter and Waldinger, 1996:50). Even if native-born blacks wanted to work at the reduced wage, they do not have access to the jobs because the work is controlled by Spanish-speaking crew leaders. African Americans have had greater success obtaining work in large firms or in the government where there are formal hiring structures. In the smaller firms and in the subcontractor environment, those workers connected to ethnic networks have a better chance.

Reorganizing the Production Process, Geographic Relocation, and the Weakening of Unions

Over the past 20 years, the meat-packing industry reorganized its production techniques to shift much of the cutting and packaging of meat from unionized butchers in grocery stores to lower cost packing houses. This move was accompanied by geographic shifts of production from Midwestern cities to small towns in rural areas of the Midwest and High Plains region (Stanley, 1988). The management was willing to take the risk because networks of immigrants—first Southeast Asian refugees and later Mexican immigrants—were available to perform this work (Lamphere et. al., 1994). IBP, the nation's leading meat packer, recruits Mexican workers directly from Mexico and along the border. The gains for the company in reduced labor costs and increased speed of production have been remarkable. Both the proportion of the labor force protected by union contracts and the proportion of domestic workers involved in cutting meat have been greatly reduced (Grey, 1995).

Another example of geographic shift occurred in the Northern California furniture industry in the 1980's. The competition of low-cost labor plants in Southern California forced the closing of some plants, while others moved from the unionized San Francisco Bay Area to California's Central Valley. Before the geographic shift, wages were well above those of Southern California, and the Northern firms had a mixed workforce with many U.S. born and long-settled immigrants (Mines, 1985a).

The melon industry in Northern California in the early 1980's changed its production process without any apparent efficiency advantage. It greatly reduced its fully mechanized packing house activities and moved its melon packing to the field. In the sheds, a unionized crew of mostly U.S.-born workers was eliminated while the predominantly Mexican field crews earning much lower wages were assigned the extra work (Runsten and Archibald, 1992).

Unions have also been weakened directly by the use of recent immigrants. The Mission Foods tortilla factory strike of 1982 saw management first lower wages by 40 percent. Then, when the U.S.-born and settled immigrant workforce went on strike, the Mexican managers intentionally brought in recently arrived strikebreakers and defeated the strike. Some of the former workers returned to work at the reduced rate but most left (Mines, 1985b). Another example of manipulation of unions with the use of immigrants occurred in the Los Angeles hotel industry in the early 1980's. To lower costs, management switched from a Teamsters union local made up mostly of native black crews to Seafarers Local whose members were mostly recent immigrant crews (Mines and Runsten, 1985). Despite these case study findings, the immigrant status of workers cannot always be used to weaken union strength. In a case study of undocumented workers in a waterbed factory in Los Angeles in the late 1980's, Delgado (1993) relates how a successful union campaign was launched, and a contract was won.

Conclusions

Case study work does not support a single summary conclusion. In fact, its practitioners have formulated two seemingly contradictory hypotheses from their work. The effects of immigration may well vary significantly with the attributes of the workers—both native and foreign—involved, and the context into which immigrants move.

Waldinger illustrates that labor market reconfiguration is a dynamic process. At a given point in time, specific ethnic groups (native or foreign) may dominate particular labor markets. But forces such as domestic and international migration, differential population growth, and the aging of the dominant group gradually alter the composition of the incoming labor supply. As this happens, control of those markets may pass voluntarily from one subgroup to the next.

Immigrant groups that are well endowed with human and financial capital are often able to form self-help mechanisms, allowing them to defend themselves well in the new environment. The entrepreneurial class

within such groups can provide employment and training opportunities to its coethnics. Ethnic loyalty allows merchants a natural market for its unique products. This same loyalty leads to schemes of rotating credit that can permit skilled but resource-scarce immigrants a chance to start their own businesses. The ethnic loyalty also induces skilled workers to form ethnic niches in the open economy from which they can help their coethnics gain access to opportunities for advancement.

However, some immigrant networks operate without the benefit of their religious and business leaders. These groups are often characterized by a constantly replenished influx of solo male newcomers, particularly in the agricultural sector. This type of flow is unable to form a self-sufficient enclave from which ethnic advancement can occur. Instead, the migrants find themselves continuously taken advantage of by employers aided by coethnic middlemen. Many of the immigrants in these networks cannot achieve mobility out of depressed work environments.

There is ample evidence that both types of networks, completely integrated communities and solo immigrant recruitment, exist. The ethnic succession and ethnic displacement hypotheses are not necessarily contradictory. Instead, they help explain the different roles played by immigrant networks in different circumstances. Both the make-up of the network itself—namely its cohesiveness, educational level, and resources—and the outside environment in which it finds itself determine the immigrant group's ability to advance and its affect on competing or complementary population groups.

Immigration policy and labor policy can be improved by better understanding the distinct behavior of different types of immigrant networks. Information about those groups who may be adversely affected by immigration provides insights that can be valuable in improving worker protections and enforcement within these labor markets, as well as retraining and reemploying displaced workers.

Bibliography for Chapter 5

- Amendola, S., D. Griffith, and L. Gunter; "The peach industry in Georgia and South Carolina"; Report of the Commission on Agricultural Workers; Appendix 1; 1993; Washington, DC.
- Bailey, T.; *Immigrant and Native Workers*; 1987; Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- "Commission on agricultural workers, report to congress"; Case Studies and Research Reports; Appendix I; 1993; Washington, DC.
- Delgado, H.; *New Immigrants and Old Unions*; 1993; Philadelphia: Temple Press.
- Gabbard, S., R. Mines, and B. Boccalandro; "Migrant farmworkers: pursuing security in an unstable labor market"; Research Report No. 5; 1994; U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy; Washington, DC.
- Glassel-Brown, E.; "Immigration policy and Colombian textile workers in New England"; Paper presented at U.S. DOL Conference on Immigration; September 1988; Washington, DC.
- Grey, M.; "Pork, poultry, and newcomer in Storm Lake, Iowa"; *Any Way You Cut It: Meat Processing and Small-Town America*; edited by D. Stull, D. Griffith, and M. Broadway; pages 109-127; 1995; University Press of Kansas.
- Kissam, E. and A. Garcia; "The pickle cucumber and apple industries in Southwest Michigan"; Report of the Commission on Agricultural Workers; Appendix 1; 1993; Washington, DC.
- Lamphere, L., A. Stepick, and G. Grenier (eds.); *Newcomers in the Workplace: Immigrants and the Restructuring of the U.S. Economy*; 1994; Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lichter, M. and R. Waldinger; "Black/immigrant labor market competition: new insights from a case study of the hospital industry in Los Angeles"; manuscript; 1996; UCLA.
- Mines, R.; "Workers in California furniture manufacturing: domestic and immigrant workers"; manuscript; 1985a; Berkeley, California.
- Mines, R.; "Tortillas: a bi-national industry"; manuscript; 1985b; Berkeley, California.
- Mines, R. and R. Anzaldúa; *New Migrants vs. Old Migrants: Alternative Labor Market Structures in the California Citrus Industry*; Monograph No. 9, Program in U.S.-Mexican Studies; 1982; University of California, San Diego.
- Mines, R. and D. Runsten; "Immigrant networks and California industrial sectors"; manuscript; 1985; Berkeley, California.
- Mines, R. and J. Avina; "Immigrants and labor standards: the case of California janitors"; *Labor Market Interdependence*; edited by J. Bustamante, C. Reynolds, and R. Hinojosa; 1992.
- Nalven, J. and C. Fredrickson; "The employers' view, is there a need for a guestworker program?"; 1982; San Diego, California: Community Research Associates.
- Portes, A. and R. Bach; *Latin Journey*; 1985; Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Runsten, D.; "Mexican immigrants and the California-Mexico role in the U.S. shoe industry"; 1985; Berkeley, California.
- Runsten, D. and S. Archibald; "Technology and labor-intensive agriculture: competition between the United States and Mexico"; *Labor Market Interdependence*; edited by J. Bustamante, C. Reynolds, and R. Hinojosa; 1992.
- Stanley, K.; "The role of immigrant and refugee labor in the restructuring of the Midwestern meatpacking industry"; Paper presented at U.S. DOL Conference on Immigration; September 1988; Washington, DC.
- U.S. Department of Labor, International Labor Affairs Bureau; "The effects of immigration on the U.S. economy and labor market"; 1989; Washington, DC.
- U.S. General Accounting Office; *Illegal Aliens: Influence of Illegal Workers on Wages and Working Conditions of Legal Workers*; 1988; [GAO/PEMD-88-13BR].
- Waldinger, R.; "Taking care of the guests: the impact of immigrants on services—an industry case study"; *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*; volume 16: number 1; 1992.

Waldinger, R.; *Still the Promised City*; 1996; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Zabin, C., M. Kearney, A. Garcia, D. Runsten, and C. Nagengast; *Mixtec Migrants in California Agriculture*; 1993; Davis, California: California Institute for Rural Studies.

Professional Labor Markets and Immigration

The changes brought about by immigration may have both positive and negative repercussions. For example, to the extent that immigrants agree to wage offerings deemed unacceptable by similarly employed natives, producers and even consumers may perceive the impact as positive: that is, lower costs. If, however, those competing natives subsequently experience eroding wages and working conditions, they will perceive the impact as decidedly negative during the period of adjustment. The ripple effects of cost reduction may be felt by consumers thousands of miles from the site of immigrant concentration. Eroding wages and working conditions will presumably be most palpable to natives living near, and competing with, immigrant workers that have a lower reservation wage. Whether or not increased immigration affects the broader aggregate outcomes in a labor market, a comprehensive assessment of the labor market impacts of immigration must also emphasize the effects on resident workers in the particular locality, industry, and/or set of occupations.

Econometric studies employ relatively large data sets, such as the decennial census or major national surveys. Although such sources distinguish between citizen and noncitizen aliens, lawful permanent residents cannot be distinguished from temporary entrants, let alone those in specific categories of entry.¹ Sensitivity to the impacts of specific entry groups—the basic building blocks of immigration law—requires greater precision. This requirement necessitates data on the actual stock of entrants in specific geographic, industrial, and occupational labor markets, as well as the terms under which those entrants were admitted to participate in U.S. labor markets and if those terms are being met.

Regrettably, the existing Federal data system is not designed to monitor the stocks of foreign workers resident in this country who are permanent resident aliens or temporary nonimmigrants. This data gap is significant and seriously constrains quantitative analysis of migratory impacts.

Despite this dearth of key information, interest in the numbers and potential impacts of various immigrant groups has continued to grow. The passage of IMMACT90 turned the spotlight on a group whose entry had previously gone largely unchallenged: immigrant professionals. A decade ago, it was widely believed that this nation faced an impending shortage of scientific personnel (Hudson Institute, 1987; National Research Council, 1984; National Research Council, 1988). Leading scientists' projections helped persuade Congress to enact the 1990 legislation.² IMMACT90 altered the terms of admission for temporary professional workers under the H-1B visa covering persons in "specialty occupations"—defined as occupations requiring a baccalaureate degree—and increased the number of skilled, permanent, immigrant workers admissible each year. Immigration researchers have recently become more interested in the role of high-skilled immigrants in the U.S. economy. This new inquiry concerns the number and characteristics of workers in affected professional labor markets and, in some instances, how those labor markets have performed since the enactment of IMMACT90.

¹ Empirical researchers do attempt to impute entry-status (see Chapter 2), but such procedures are inferior to information on admissions class.

² Hearing before the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology, U.S. House of Representatives, One Hundred First Congress, July 31, 1990.

Recent Literature on Foreign Professionals

Despite the well-documented link between higher education and job quality, college graduates cannot be assured of finding college-level jobs. In 1992, 23 percent of all workers whose highest degree was a BA held noncollege level jobs (Hecker, 1995). Fully 20 percent of those with bachelor's degrees, 11 percent of those with master's degrees, and 7 percent of those with doctorates earned less than the median earnings reported by high school graduates. Recent studies suggest that in some professional fields, job prospects for new graduates may fall short of expectations and that one factor contributing to potential job uncertainty may be immigration.

Employment within universities and research institutions has been a subject of many recent studies (Casals and Associates, 1996; National Academy of Sciences, 1995; Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology, 1995; Finn et.al., 1995; North, 1995). Because the number of immigrants and nonimmigrants in this sector is both large and growing, the scholars contributing to this literature are often, themselves, interested parties. Given their training, networks of communication within and across disciplines, contractual relationships with private industry and government, and their celebrated penchant for writing, academics have much to contribute to the immigration policy debate. The fields they represent often recruit both nationally and internationally and conduct annual surveys that have become a source of "new" data on trends in immigrant stocks and flows. In some instances, their analyses resemble statistical case studies of national labor markets.

Nativity of U.S. Professionals

One study that provides a useful baseline is that of Bouvier and Simcox (1994), which explored 1990 Census data regarding the nativity of professionals in various fields. Although the authors could not identify categories of entry or immigrant status, they did look closely at the infusion of foreign talent into specific areas of potential impact. They found that within the professional population, broadly defined, only 8.2 percent of workers were foreign-born persons. Yet, immigrants held a disproportionate share of certain highly coveted professional jobs. For example, in 1990, more than 20 percent of U.S. physicians were foreign-born persons. Bouvier and Simcox concluded from census data that, in many of the professions studied, immigrants had completed more years of schooling and had far more technical training than did their native counterparts.

A sample of 215,000 of the individuals first studied by Bouvier and Simcox have since been tracked by the National Science Foundation's (NSF) National Survey of College Graduates (NSCG). The NSCG sample follows the educational and labor market experiences of persons whose 1990 Census response indicated they had a college or higher degree. Like the census, this survey enumerates population stocks without differentiating by class of entry or immigrant status. However, it brings the profile of foreign-born professionals substantially closer to the present.

NSCG data reveal that, as of April 1993, two out of three foreign-born persons in the United States who held doctorates in sciences and engineering (S&E) had attained them in the United States (NSF, 1995a). Just 9.8 percent of all S&E bachelor's degrees, 18 percent of all master's degrees, and fully 23 percent of all doctorates were held by the foreign-born persons. The percentage of Ph.D.s who were foreign-born persons varied tremendously across fields as the following figures show: nonscientific fields and medicine (12.4), social sciences (13.1), life sciences (21.3), physical sciences (25.9), mathematics and computer sciences (33.6), and engineering (40.3). Slightly more than half (50.6) of the nation's civil engineers at that time were foreign-born persons.

Because the Ph.D. is essentially a teaching and research degree, NSCG examined the share of all Ph.D. scientists and engineers engaged in research and development activities. It showed that in 1993—in every major field of S&E—immigrants were more likely than natives to be engaged in research and development. Just 44.8 percent of native S&E doctorates, as compared with 58.4 percent of the foreign-born doctorates (and 62.4 percent of the foreign-born persons who had received Ph.D.s from U.S. universities), were engaged in research and development activities in 1993.

Such statistics are frequently cited as evidence of the vigor of U.S. educational institutions and the fact that the “best and brightest” scientists and engineers are frequently foreign-born persons. A growing share of all new U.S. doctorates in a wide range of science and engineering fields are, in fact, foreign-born persons. The reasons for this phenomenon, and its labor market implications, are the subject of numerous studies (National Research Council, 1988; North, 1995; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1995).

While there is evidence that many educators intentionally favor native over foreign students (North, 1995), the opposite may be true in certain important labor markets. Employers, including some administrators of academic and research programs, often willingly discuss what they consider to be their justifiable preference for foreign-born applicants over native job candidates (Casals and Associates, 1996). Academicians and researchers often criticize native scientists and engineers for their “weak” technical backgrounds. Employers in private industry sometimes view native candidates as overly specialized (NAS, 1995). There are also complaints that native workers expect higher wages for a given job than do their foreign-born peers. The lower wage demand of a foreign worker is hardly surprising; however, if an implicit part of the compensation package is the highly prized but nonpecuniary benefit—the prospect of U.S. citizenship.

Many employers who petition on behalf of foreign candidates say they do so to obtain quick access to technical skills. In fields such as software development, technology is changing so rapidly that specific skills quickly become obsolete. Employers often see their international competitiveness as being dependent on timely access to recent graduates in those fields—whatever their national origin. They also see employment of foreign workers as a means of enlarging foreign markets and enhancing cultural diversity in the workplace.

Flows of Immigrants Within the Professional Workforce

The stock of workers in any discipline is dynamic. While new graduates, immigrant admissions, and nonimmigrant entries continually add to the total, growth is slowed by emigration, retirements, and death. A number of recent studies have looked into specific aspects of this process.

NSF’s annual report, *Immigrant Scientists, Engineers, and Technicians*, looks at the attributes of scientists and engineers who immigrate to the United States on permanent immigrant visas each year (NSF, 1995b). Admissions of scientists and engineers, as defined by the INS, increased by 62 percent between 1991 and 1992, a change NSF attributed in part to IMMACT90. More than two-thirds of all S&E permanent admissions in 1992 were engineers. Another 14.8 percent were mathematicians, while natural and social scientists accounted for the remaining 12.2 and 4.8 percent, respectively.

The contribution of nonimmigrants to the stock of professionals is considerably more difficult to measure. The data are weak, often counting the number of individual entries into the United States rather than the number of individuals having nonimmigrant visas.

The lack of information on nonimmigrants makes their overall impact difficult to assess. One prime example is the H-1B category covering workers in specialty occupations. Assumptions about the share of the Labor Condition Application-requested temporary workers who actually fill jobs, the length of their stays in that status (whether on each visit or in the aggregate), and the number of entries per individual can lead to quite different conclusions about the stock of H-1Bs resident at any time.

Classifications by job title only adds to the quantification problem. For example, estimates of the impact of immigrants within the software development and information technology fields—a highly contested area—will depend on whether or not the researcher considers the potentially affected occupations to include all engineers, electrical engineers, software engineers, computer scientists, computer systems analysts, and/or computer programmers.³

One unpublished analysis, by the Software Professionals Political Action Committee (SOFTPAC), considers migrants in the software industry to adversely affect engineers—the term being broadly defined (SOFTPAC, 1995). SOFTPAC concluded that 30,000 foreign-born temporary engineering workers entered the U.S. workforce in 1993 and that “the entire demand for engineers in the 1990-1993 period could have been met by new college graduates, and still left over 75,000 unemployed engineers” (p. 7). Citing a recent decline in college engineering enrollments as evidence that new students realize job prospects in that field are eroding, SOFTPAC warns that “the Immigration Act of 1990 may, in the end, create the very skill shortage it was designed to address” (p. 8).

The international mobility of nonimmigrant aliens is especially difficult to measure. The INS recently published new estimates of duration of stay based on departure records of nonimmigrants in various visa categories (U.S. INS, 1996). Two analytical limitations of these data result from the way they are collected. The published means and medians (1) measure periods of U.S. residence between international trips rather than over the lifetime of the visa and (2) they do not take into consideration residential durations of aliens who remain continuously resident in the United States. Therefore, estimates of the length of time aliens remain in this country on a particular type of visa are downwardly biased.

Finn, et al. (1995) have calculated “stay rates” of foreign-born science and engineering Ph.D.s following graduation from U.S. universities. Looking at Social Security records of members of the class of 1984, they found that, of the S&E graduates who received Ph.D.s while on temporary visas, about 42 percent held jobs in the United States in 1992. In the physical and engineering sciences, the stay rate was even higher (46 and 48 percent, respectively).

Another approach was taken by the General Accounting Office (GAO), which in 1992 looked at the permanence of jobs for which nonimmigrants workers were requested (U.S. GAO, 1992). One question at issue in this study was the extent to which employers petitioned for temporary alien skilled workers to fill permanent jobs—a practice that is permissible under the law. Based on pre-IMMACT90 data (October 1988-March 1990), GAO determined that about half of the jobs filled by nonimmigrants holding H-1 visas (the precursor to the H-1B) were permanent jobs. Of the 1,647 H-1 nonimmigrants sampled within the telecommunications industry, all held permanent jobs.

There has been little or no research concerning nativity differentials in retirement and death. Nonetheless, the relative youth of international migrants, when coupled with the growing pace of international entries, suggests that in the near future the incidence of retirement and death will fall heaviest on native-born professionals, further increasing the share of foreign-born workers in these fields.

Disciplinary Introspection

The prominence of foreign-born professionals in their ranks is frequently cited as evidence that U.S. universities, research institutions, and the business community need, and should therefore be granted, free access to the world’s “best and brightest” minds. However, other observers point to the repercussions for this country’s own best and brightest, and their conclusions are considerably less optimistic.

³ Also at issue is if petitioners list job titles incorrectly on labor condition applications, or if these titles really connote entirely different functions.

The Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology (CPST), a private nonprofit organization whose primary mission is to collect and disseminate data, recently examined trends in the labor market conditions confronting young researchers. Their study tapped data from three important surveys: the annual Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED),⁴ the biennial Survey of Doctorate Recipients (SDR), and the annual Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering⁵ (CPST, 1995).

At the time of graduation, new Ph.D.s are asked about their plans for the immediate future. These studies show that between 1973 and 1993 there has been a decline in the share of S&E doctoral recipients having commitments to work coupled with a rise in the share having commitments to further study: for example, in postdoctoral positions. While the share of permanent resident aliens planning to remain in the United States has changed little (from 85 to 90 percent), there has been a substantial increase in the share of nonimmigrant graduates with similar plans (from 31 to 55 percent). Although the Commission encountered considerable interest in the link between immigration and employment prospects in these fields, it was unable to examine this link directly because of a shortage of pertinent immigration statistics.

Findings of surveys conducted by six major professional societies were included in the CPST report. These studies noted the following indications of slack labor markets for young professionals:

- **The American Chemical Society** determined that 38 percent of the Ph.D. graduates in the class of 1994 had found full-time employment by the fall following their graduation (down from 40 percent in 1993). The share holding full-time jobs outside their field at that point was 2.3 percent (up from 1.7 percent in 1993). The share of new Ph.D. chemical engineers taking postdoctoral positions increased from 8 percent in 1991 to 15 percent in 1992, to 16.7 percent in 1993, and to 40 percent in 1994.
- **The Computer Research Association** found that the share of new Ph.D.s employed in academia had declined from 39 percent in 1990-91 to 36 percent in 1993. Of the 36 percent with academic jobs, 8 percent were in departments other than computer science or computer engineering.
- **The American Geological Institute** national survey revealed that total employment of geoscientists has decreased from 83,469 in 1988 to 70,245 in 1991.
- **The American Mathematical Society** found that U.S. citizens, who accounted for 76 percent of total Ph.D.s graduating from mathematics program in 1976-77, accounted for just 44 percent of the total in 1994. The percentage of doctorates still seeking jobs in the fall following their graduation rose steadily from 2 percent in 1990, to 5 percent in 1991, to 6.7 percent in 1992, and to 8.9 percent in 1993. For the fourth consecutive year, there was a decrease in recruitment of faculty.
- **The American Institute of Physics** reported that, largely because of the increase in foreign students receiving graduate degrees, the number of new physics Ph.D.s grew by 60 percent between 1982 and 1994. Between 1980 and 1993, the number of new Ph.D.s finding permanent positions dropped by almost half. Of those working full-time 6 months after graduation, the share who had taken less than 6 months to find jobs dropped from 94 to just 77 percent. Also, the number of first-year graduate students in physics dropped by 20 percent over the last 3 years of this period.
- **The American Psychological Association** reported that in 1993 doctoral unemployment was relatively low, and there had been no significant rise in time required to locate employment following graduation. More than half of the Ph.D.s. graduating in 1993 had found jobs before graduation and another 15 percent did so within 6 months. However, in some subfields the share occupying postdoctoral positions had risen substantially between 1986 and 1993.

Because it attracts relatively few immigrant scientists (just 1 percent of all S&E permanent immigrants in 1992), the field of psychology is an interesting control. These data illustrate the complexity of the issue. Increases in lower-paying postdoctoral activity appear to be occurring even in markets with relatively few foreign entrants.

⁴ Funded by the National Research Council.

⁵ Sponsored jointly by the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health.

Certain unique features of the educational system, together with immigration policy, may enable universities to expand without regard to local (U.S.) market conditions. For example, the number of graduating native-born Ph.D. physicists has remained fairly constant at about 700 per year for most of the 1982-1994 period. However, the number of foreign degrees increased from approximately 200 to 700 during this period (Czujko, 1996). This ballooning supply of Ph.D. physicists has likely contributed to the destabilization of employment prospects for new graduates.

These reports of recent graduates having longer and less successful job searches may indicate that supply is beginning to exceed demand. Given the large proportion of foreign students who express intentions to remain in the United States, their growing numbers may lead to weak labor markets and wage stagnation, making these fields less attractive for U.S. students to enter.

In recent years, Congress has publicly questioned the motives of some of IMMACT90s most ardent academic supporters.⁶ Federal programs, expert panels, and individual researchers alike are evaluating U.S. immigration policies designed to admit a growing number of foreign professionals as nonimmigrant and/or immigrant workers (U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform, 1995; NAS, 1995; CPST, 1995; North, 1995).

Among analysts detecting deterioration in the employment prospects for natives in the S&E fields, reasons put forward to explain the destabilization of the S&E job market are varied. Some analysts fault antidiscrimination regulations and affirmative action for tipping the balance in favor of foreign applicants (Robb, 1995). Others cite evidence that funding mechanisms require U.S. natives to incur more educational debt than their foreign-born classmates, a disincentive to native graduate enrollment (U.S. GAO, 1995; North, 1995). As the result of the growing graduate enrollment of foreign students in the fields of science and engineering, the pool of qualified candidates is increasingly comprised of foreign-born persons. NAS' Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (NAS, 1995) found that:

"The increase in foreign graduate students with temporary visas accounted for 65.5% of the net increase in annual science and engineering Ph.D. awards 1986 to 1993, and an increase in the number of foreign-citizen Ph.D.s with permanent visas contributed almost another 11% to the increase. Foreign citizens achieved a majority of science and engineering postdoctoral appointments in the United States in 1991." (p. 69)

"...If graduate programs are filled with foreigners, the programs do not have to make adjustments in enrollments or in content to make them more relevant to U.S. students. Nor do businesses have to increase salaries to increase their supply of American students" (p. 71).

Other observers trace the avowed destabilization to the longstanding "special handling" provisions of immigration law⁷ that can place natives at a disadvantage relative to equally qualified foreign-born applicants when competing for teaching positions in colleges and universities (Weinstein, 1996).

⁶ Hearing before the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology, U.S. House of Representatives, One Hundred Second Congress, April 8, 1992.

⁷ Section 212(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The final rule implementing this provision States "In most occupations, U.S. workers are considered available for the job opportunity if they are able, willing, and at least minimally qualified for the job offered to the alien. In the cases of job opportunities as college and university teachers, U.S. workers must be at least as qualified or more qualified than the alien..." *Federal Register*, December 19, 1980, p. 83931 (emphasis added).

Most significantly, in recent years, the three principal sites of employment for Ph.D. scientists and engineers—colleges and universities, private industry, and government—have undergone simultaneous downsizing. Stagnation or cutbacks in recruitment for tenure-track positions have occurred even as the number of graduating Ph.D.s in these fields rises (Czujko, 1996; McClure, 1995). Downsizing of private industry has forced recent graduates into competition with experienced S&E professionals, to their mutual disadvantage (Czujko, 1996). Federal downsizing has had both direct employment and indirect contracting implications.

Although the relative importance of these individual factors is subject to dispute, expert panels have weighed their collective implications. NAS (1995) has concluded that:

"Although many recent graduates are frustrated by their inability to find basic-research positions, it appears that the growth in nonresearch and applied research and development positions is large enough to absorb most graduates" (p. 3).

The CPST (1995) sees the implications as more serious.

"The current labor market for researchers recently granted their doctorates has deteriorated over the past 5 years. It is taking new doctorates longer to find permanent positions and a growing number are taking temporary, low-paying post-doctoral positions for some number of years while they await an opening. This trend should be of concern for three major reasons.

First, as a nation we make substantial investments in the education and training of these doctorates through government support to both individuals and universities. Second, as individuals, these doctorates make substantial personal investments... While these doctorates will eventually find employment, it may not be the employment they had expected. ...Third, the "shelf" or "half" life of knowledge in these fields is likely to introduce additional difficulties for scientists who are out of the lab for relatively long periods of time. They may at some point cease to be employable in their fields" (p. 23).

The Administration is aware of this growing body of literature and the many arguments presented in favor of, and against, restricting admissions of certain foreign-born professionals. The issues are complex and deserve close and continuing scrutiny. In particular, attention needs to be paid to permanent employment-based immigration and the temporary nonimmigrant worker programs.

Evidence of Abuse Within the H-1B Nonimmigrant and Permanent Labor Certification Programs

While the vast majority of those employers using the H-1B program do not misuse it, there have been several documented cases of abuse. Evidence of such abuse has been gathered by investigators of the Employment Standards Administration's Wage and Hour Division (ESA/WHD) and auditors of DOL's Office of the Inspector General (OIG).

WHd investigators have identified several situations in which employment of H-1B nonimmigrants has occurred at the expense of comparable U.S. workers. Two particularly egregious cases illustrate this point.

Syntel, Inc., a company in Troy, Michigan, providing computer personnel and services on contract to other companies, had a workforce of more than 80 percent H-1B immigrants, most of whom were computer analysts from India. Syntel had entered into a contract with American International Group, Inc. (AIG), a large insurance company headquartered in Livingston, New Jersey, to provide AIG with computer services. Consequently, nearly 250 of AIG's U.S. workers were then laid off. Some of these U.S. workers charged that they were required to train their H-1B nonimmigrant replacements during their last few weeks of employment. Such displacement is, incidentally, perfectly legal under current U.S. immigration law.

In its effort to cut costs, however, Syntel went still further, violating the already quite permissive terms of this law. Syntel management had attested in writing that the company would pay its H-1B workers the prevailing wage—a requirement established to protect U.S. workers' wages from erosion. WHD found that Syntel, in its operations in New Jersey, had willfully paid its Indian computer programmers \$34,000 per year rather than the prevailing rate of \$41,000 required by law—underpayment of nearly 20 percent. As a result, Syntel agreed to pay nearly \$78,000 in back wages to 40 H-1B employees and to take other steps to develop U.S. workers to reduce its dependence on nonimmigrant workers.

To date, WHD has handled 24 such cases involving H-1B workers in computer-related occupations. Underpayment of the 89 H-1B nonimmigrant workers in these cases, most of whom worked for contractors, amount to more than \$200,000.

In the healthcare field, Rehab One, another Michigan company, went into business providing temporary physical therapists—in this case exclusively from Poland—to health care facilities, most of which were in Texas. Following WHD's investigation of a complaint against Rehab One, the company agreed to pay back wages of more than \$460,000 to 54 therapist employees. Although it was required to pay a prevailing wage of as much as \$2,800 per month, in certain periods the company had actually paid its Polish therapists as little as \$500 per month.

To date, WHD has handled 13 such cases involving employers of H-1B physical and occupational therapists, nearly all of them contractors. Together, these companies owed more than \$885,000 in back wages to 242 temporary foreign workers in physical and occupational therapy, evidence that these H-1B workers were being used to exert downward pressure on the prevailing wage in this occupation.

Altogether, WHD investigators have identified 87 cases in which a total of 397 H-1B workers have been underpaid a collective sum of \$1,800,000.

OIG's audit (U.S. DOL, 1996) tracked the outcome of cases in which DOL has issued Permanent Labor Certifications (PLC) or accepted temporary H-1B Labor Condition Applications (LCA) during FY1993. OIG auditors had the authority to check the veracity of statements made in the initial applications, examine the actual behavior of petitioning employers and employees, and consider other issues over which DOL has little or no authority. Their findings pertain exclusively to successful applicants: that is, those whose applications for PLCs or LCAs were approved by DOL during FY1993 and subsequently led to admission, adjustment of status, or INS approval for their H-1B job petition. These included 24,184 permanent resident aliens and 61,250 H-1B workers.

This audit revealed several disquieting facts about the H-1B program. During the survey period, the OIG found that 75 percent of the H-1B aliens studied worked for employers that did not adequately document that the wage specified on the labor condition application was the appropriate prevailing wage. In cases where the H-1B worker's actual wage could be determined, 19 percent were being paid below the wage specified on the LCA. Four percent of H-1B workers studied did not appear to be employees of the petitioning employer. Some were being paid as independent contractors; others, for whom colleges or universities had petitioned, were actually on postdoctoral fellowships.

OIG determined that "the LCA program has become a stepping stone to obtain permanent resident status not only for the 'best and brightest' specialists but also for students, relatives and friends" (p. 3).

OIG's investigation of the permanent certification program likewise revealed a number of disquieting facts. OIG found that at the time employers applied for labor certification on behalf of the perspective immigrant, 99 percent of the aliens in question were already living in the United States, 74 percent were already working for the sponsoring employer, and 16 percent were working out of status (p. 2).

Employers had signed sworn statements indicating that no U.S. worker could be found to fill the job in question and that they had to offer permanent residence to ensure the alien's availability. Yet when OIG auditors examined company records after the aliens had received permanent residence, they found that 4 percent of the alien employees had terminated their jobs with the petitioning employer even before adjusting status, another 11 percent never worked for the petitioning employer after receipt of permanent residence, 17 percent left the petitioning employer within 6 months of status adjustment, and 7 percent never worked for the employer who petitioned on their behalf (p. 16).

At the time OIG auditors spoke with petitioning employers, 41 percent of the certified immigrants had already left the jobs for which they had been granted lawful permanent residence to fill. Of the jobs thus vacated, 57 percent had not been refilled, 39 percent had been refilled—3 out of 4 by U.S. citizens—and information was lacking on the status of the remaining 4 percent.

The elaborate "labor market test" associated with the permanent certification program was found to be severely flawed. In the last 6 months of 1994, the State Employment Security Agencies referred 28,682 U.S. workers to employers to be considered for the jobs they were petitioning to fill with permanent resident aliens. Only 5 Americans were actually placed—a 0.02 percent hire rate.

In sum, OIG found that the permanent labor certification program "is being used to satisfy the needs of the aliens—the attainment of the green card—rather than to provide employers access to foreign labor where sufficient U.S. workers are not available" (p. 16).

Conclusions

The international mobility of skilled professionals has grown apace with educational opportunities, international trade, high-speed communications, and low-cost transportation. Hundreds of thousands of foreign students now enter U.S. universities each year, most pursuing professional degrees, particularly in S&E. In addition to tuition, these students give their host universities a well prepared student body, cultural diversity, academic strength, and a cadre of low-cost teaching and research assistants. After completing their initial degrees, many remain to pursue additional degrees and/or postdoctoral or academic appointments. Others move into the world of business, where their technical skills, determination, and strong work ethic are often highly esteemed. Access to the world's best and brightest talent has become a mainstay of the U.S. academic and business communities. Many businesses now contend that without this access they would lose their competitive edge and be forced to move operations, as well as thousands of jobs, abroad.

Labor certification/attestation requirements and certain annual numerical limits notwithstanding, highly skilled aliens have relatively little difficulty entering the U.S. labor market. Various nonimmigrant visas enable thousands of well educated aliens to enter this country and/or complete the transition from academic to professional life in the United States. IMMACT90 significantly increased the annual numerical limitation for employment-based permanent immigration, at the same time tipping the scale further toward professional entries.

The effects of these developments are perceived differently by those who employ and those who seek employment. Universities, research institutions, and the business community contend there is a compelling need for such access. The technical skills, determination, and strong work ethic of foreign-born students and professionals are often highly esteemed. Nonetheless, a growing number of highly trained native scientists and engineers contend that ready access to foreign professionals has reduced their own job opportunities, slowed job placement, increased average time spent in postdoctoral positions, and/or forced them to leave the field for which they spent both years and considerable financial resources in training.

The literature on this issue is still largely deductive. A number of factors have helped slow the growth of demand for scientists and engineers, an erosion whose magnitude is itself subject to dispute. Nonetheless, review of the available employment statistics from a wide range of fields suggests that job-search problems have been particularly acute in fields that attract large numbers of foreign professionals: that is, engineering, mathematics, computer, and physical sciences. Given the "shelf life" of technical knowledge in these fields, lengthy periods of unemployment or underemployment may permanently derail the career paths of native Ph.D.s who are unable to apply and continually enhance their training.

DOL's WHD has identified numerous violations of labor and immigration law involving college-educated temporary foreign workers, particularly in the fields of computer science and physical therapy. Many of these involve illegal employment practices of job contractors. DOL's OIG has likewise found evidence of widespread abuse within the H-1B temporary and DOL's PLC programs. Therefore, it is no longer appropriate to assume that high-skilled immigration has entirely beneficial or, at worst, innocuous effects. The implications of such entries must be closely monitored.

Bibliography for Chapter 6

Bouvier, L.F. and D. Simcox; *Foreign-Born Professionals in the United States*; 1994; Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies.

Brennan, M.B.; "Tenure: money woes stress universities, reviving debates on need for tenure"; *Chemical Engineering News*; October 23, 1995.

Casals and Associates, Inc.; *Skilled Foreign Workers in the H-1B and Permanent Labor Certification Programs: Experiences and Perceptions of Stakeholders*; Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Immigration Policy and Research; 1996.

Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology; *Assessing Imbalance Between Young Researchers and Employment Opportunities*; Report prepared for the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation by E.L. Babco, A.E. Fechter, and C.D. Gaddy; 1995.

Czujko, R.; "Realities of the physics job market"; manuscript; 1996; American Institute of Physics; @ http://aps.org/jobs/aip_article/index.html.

Finn, M.G., L.A. Pennington, and K.H. Anderson; *Foreign Nationals Who Receive Science or Engineering Ph.D.s from U.S. Universities: Stay Rates and Characteristics of Stayers*; Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy; 1995.

Hecker, D.E.; "Further analyses of the labor market for college graduates"; *Monthly Labor Review*; February 1995.

Hudson Institute; *Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the Twenty-First Century*; 1987; Indianapolis: Hudson Institute.

McClure, D.E.; "Employment experiences of 1990-1991 U.S. institution doctoral recipients in the mathematical sciences"; 1995; *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*; @ <http://www.ams.org/publications/notices/199507/mcclure.html>

National Academy of Sciences, Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy; *Reshaping the Graduate Education of Scientists and Engineers*; 1995; Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council, Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel; *Labor Market Conditions for Engineers: Is There a Shortage?*; 1984; *Proceedings of a Symposium*, Washington, DC.

National Research Council, Committee on the International Exchange and Movement of Engineers; *Foreign and Foreign-Born Engineers in the United States: Infusing Talent, Raising Issues*; 1988; Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Science Foundation, Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences; "Immigrants are 23 percent of U.S. residents with S&E doctorates"; Data Brief number 15; November 14, 1995a;

National Science Foundation, Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences; *Immigrant Scientists, Engineers and Technicians: 1991-92: Detailed Statistics*; 1995b; Arlington, Virginia: National Science Foundation; (NSF 95-310).

North, D.S.; *Soothing the Establishment: The Impact of Foreign-born Scientists and Engineers in America*; 1995; Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc.

Richards, Larry; "A report on employment trends for engineers in the 1990's"; Unpublished report; 1995; Software Professionals' Political Action Committee.

Robb, James S.; *Affirmative Action for Immigrants: The Entitlement Nobody Wanted*; 1995; Petoskey, Michigan: The Social Contract Press.

U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform; *Legal Immigration: Setting Priorities*; 1995; *Legal Immigration Report to Congress*.

U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Inspector General; *The Department of Labor's Foreign Labor Certification Programs: The System Is Broken and Needs To Be Fixed*; 1996.

U.S. General Accounting Office; *Immigration and the Labor Market: Nonimmigrant Alien Workers in the United States*; 1992; [GAO/PEMD-92-17].

U.S. General Accounting Office; *Higher Education: Selected Information on Student Financial Aid Received by Legal Immigrants*; 1995; [GAO/HEHSD].

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Office of Policy and Planning; "Duration of stay of nonimmigrants departing the United States"; 1996.

Weinstein, E.; "Pandora's science policy page"; 1996; @ www.mit.edu:8001/aft/athena.mit.edu/user/e/r/erw/Pandora.html.

Conclusion to Part II

The number of immigrant admissions to the United States has fluctuated widely during the 20th century. At both the beginning and end of this century, this country has admitted more foreign nationals than at any other time in its history, while the immigration policies and poor economic conditions of the 1930's and 1940's resulted in near-record lows. For Americans who have lived through this period, perceptions of immigrant impact must be particularly vivid. It is important to recognize that despite their size, today's immigrant population and workforce play a much smaller role relative to overall population and employment than was the case a century ago.

Nonetheless, the demographic and labor market implications of immigration for the 21st century are likely to be impressive. Demographers at the Urban Institute project that, under current immigration law, roughly 70 million post-1990 immigrants and their offspring will be added to the U.S. population by 2040 (Fix and Passel, 1994). They project that the U.S. population will grow from 249 million in 1990 to 355 million by 2040, with post-1990 immigrants and their children accounting for almost two-thirds of the net population growth over this period. Under these projections, the foreign-born population will account for about 14 percent of the population by 2040 (from about 9 percent today) and more than one in four U.S. residents is projected to be either an immigrant or the child of an immigrant as of 2040.

Based on these population projections and present labor force participation behavior, these demographers predict that an additional 6 million new immigrants will join the labor force during the 1990's and another 6 million in the first decade of the 21st century. Immigration's contribution to labor force growth is thereby projected to be one-third of the labor force expansion over these decades, up from about one-quarter during the 1980's.

This report addresses the need for an ongoing evaluation of U.S. immigration policy. Both public and private sectors have long recognized the value of social impact assessment and program evaluation. Yet, the profusion of new temporary entry categories, multiple entries by nonimmigrants on one visa, and the rapid pace at which laws have changed challenge the validity of existing concepts, data systems, and research methods. Systematic and cumulative research on immigration is just beginning to keep pace with the growth and diversity of the immigration flow itself. A body of literature is now accumulating that employs increasingly sophisticated methods to explore a variety of new and pressing issues.

One simple conclusion that can be drawn from the macroeconomic literature to date is that, at the national level, the net effects of immigrants on U.S. workers are small. This synopsis echoes that of Friedberg and Hunt's (1995) conclusion:

"Despite the popular belief that immigrants have a large adverse impact on the wages and employment opportunities of the native-born population, the literature on this question does not provide much support for this conclusion. Economic theory is equivocal, and empirical estimates in a variety of settings and using a variety of approaches have shown that the effect of immigration on the labor market outcomes of natives is small...Even those natives who should be the closest substitutes with immigrant labor have not been found to suffer significantly as a result of increased immigration." (p. 42)

At the same time, several case studies, as well as simple observations, indicate that immigrants have real and sometimes substantial impacts at the State and local levels. But case studies do not necessarily show the net effects on the larger economy. We must also examine the extent to which industries, occupations, States and/or localities experience adverse labor market impacts as a result of immigration.¹ Clearly, there remains a need for empirical work with quantitative data and field observation on this question. Local studies will need to take into account unique selectivity patterns and regional effects. Detailed and systematic research is sorely lacking for specific skill and race/ethnic groupings and in particular industries and regions.

In conclusion, today there are mounting pressures for new policies on immigrant admissions. The setting in which these policies must operate has grown increasingly complex. Globalization and the reduced costs of travel have increased the sheer number and variety of immigrant groups. This profusion of groups may create more issues and points of potential conflict. Public opposition to immigration typically peaks during recessions and diminishes with economic recovery. However, the prolonged restructuring of today's nonrecessionary economy also has undercut many jobs in ways that may fuel claims of unfair competition.

Consensus on the impacts of immigration is difficult to come by given the lack of detailed data, variations in disciplinary emphasis, constant refinements in methods of analysis, disagreements about the appropriate level of analysis, philosophical differences, and the intrusion of noneconomic concerns. While there has been unprecedented interest in immigration, the situation has not changed much since the last Comprehensive Report on Immigration. Any single, simple and definitive answer to the questions posed by immigration continues to remain "essentially elusive."

¹ It is wrong to assume that effects will be adverse wherever immigrants concentrate. Research on immigrants has uncovered favorable effects as well under these conditions.

Bibliography for Conclusions to Part II

Fix, M. and J.S. Passel; Immigration and Immigrants: Setting the Record Straight; 1994; Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Friedberg, R.M. and J. Hunt; "The impact of immigrants on host country wages, employment, and growth"; Journal of Economic Perspectives; volume 9; pages 23-44; 1995.

This page is intentionally left blank.

The President's Triennial Comprehensive Report on Immigration

Part III

Education and Social Services Impacts

This page is intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR PART III

Chapter 7: Immigration and the U.S. Educational System	131
Abstract.....	131
Introduction	132
School Enrollment.....	132
Children and Youth With Limited Proficiency in English.....	132
Adults With Limited Proficiency in English.....	133
U.S. Department of Education	134
Impact of Immigrant Students on the U.S. Educational System	134
Federally Funded Educational Services for Immigrant Students.....	135
Elementary and Secondary Education	135
Adult and Vocational Education	136
Higher Education.....	136
U.S. Department of Education Programs Serving Limited English Proficient Persons	137
Tables	
Table 1.—Students Counted Under the Immigrant Education Program: FYs1992-1996	138
Table 2.—Major Programs That Served LEP Students in FY1995	140
Chapter 8: Immigration and Social Services.....	143
Introduction	144
Income Levels	144
Poverty Status	145
Public Assistance Income	145
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.....	149
Summary of Immigration's Impact on HHS Programs	149
HHS Programs and Services	152
Administration for Children and Families	152
Office of Refugee Resettlement.....	152
Office of Community Services	164

Office of Family Assistance.....	167
Office of Child Support Enforcement	168
Public Health Service.....	169
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).....	172
Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA).....	172
Administration On Aging (AoA)	173
Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA)	174
Social Security Administration.....	177
Social Security Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSDI)	177
Enumeration Process (Issuing Social Security Numbers).....	178
Supplemental Security Income.....	179
Alien Participation in the Food Stamp Program.....	181
Introduction.....	181
The Food Stamp Program.....	182
Program Description.....	182
Eligibility of Aliens in the Food Stamp Program	183
Alien Verification in the Food Stamp Program.....	184
Alien Participation in the Food Stamp Program.....	184
FCS Studies on the Effect of Immigration Reform on the Food Stamp Program	185
Appendix A: Additional Information on SAMHSA Programs.....	186
Refugee Mental Health Program	186
Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT) Block Grant	186
Community Mental Health Services Block Grant.....	186
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services (ADMS) Block Grants.....	187
Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness and Mental Health Services to the Homeless Block Grant.....	187
Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services Program for Children and Their Families Program	188
Protection and Advocacy Program for Individuals With Serious Mental Illness	188
Demonstration Grant Programs.....	189
Additional Demonstration Programs.....	189
Appendix B: Additional Information on HRSA Programs.....	190
Community and Migrant Health Centers.....	190
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant.....	190
Ryan White AIDS Services	190
Health Care for the Homeless (HCH) Services	191

Health Services for Residents of Public Housing	191
---	-----

Tables

Table 1.—Characteristics of Foreign-Born Persons and All Persons in 1990 Census, by Time of Entry and Citizenship	146
Table 2.—Receipt of Public Assistance Income by Arrival: Cohorts of Foreign-Born Households in the 1990 Census.....	148
Table 3.—Refugee Appropriations, Admissions, Time-Eligible Population, and Period of Eligibility (Months): FYs1981 to 1995.....	153
Table 4.—Refugee, Entrant, and Amerasian Arrivals by Country of Citizenship: FYs1983-1995	157
Table 5.—Refugee, Entrant, and Amerasian Arrivals by Country of Citizenship and State of Initial Resettlement: FY1994.....	158
Table 6.—Cuban and Haitian Entrant Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FYs1992-1995	160
Table 7.—AFDC Reciprocity Rates for Legal Immigrants.....	167
Table 8.—Medicaid Enrollees, FY1994	174
Table 9.—Medicare Enrollees (Millions) and Benefit Payments (\$ in Billions).....	175
Table 10.—Aliens not Paid RSDI Benefits Under Nonpayment Provisions, By Selected Month.....	177
Table 11.—Original and Replacement SSN Cards Issued: FYs1992-1995	179
Table 12.—Size of Total SSI Program, 1988-1994	180
Table 13.—Aliens in the SSI Population, 1988-1994	180
Table 14.—Citizenship Status of Food Stamp Recipients: FYs1991-1994	184

This page is intentionally left blank.

Immigration and the U.S. Educational System

Abstract

The Department of Education (DOEd) administers a variety of programs that may serve recent immigrants. Most are based on the students' education or financial need. Only the Immigrant Education program provides assistance on the basis of immigration status. In 1995, roughly \$1.6 billion in DOEd funding supported services that benefited about 4.2 million students with limited English proficiency.

U.S. Department of Education
600 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202

Introduction prepared by:
U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Services
Office of Policy and Planning

From data furnished by:
U.S. Bureau of the Census
Population Division

Introduction

The impact of immigration on the nation's education system is usually discussed in terms of the growth of school enrollments, the need to provide special services for schoolchildren whose native language is not English, and the need for English language instruction for adults. The 1990 Census provides some information on all these subjects, for both the foreign-born population and the total resident population. That information is summarized here to serve as a background and introduction to the program descriptions and data provided by DOEd throughout this chapter. All population data are presented in rounded form, but the percentages have been calculated from unrounded data.

School Enrollment

In 1990, foreign-born persons aged 3 and older accounted for 6.4 percent of total enrollment in "regular" schools at all levels, from preprimary through college. At the elementary and high school level, they numbered 2.2 million or 5.1 percent of the total enrollment of 42.6 million. Foreign-born persons were 1.9 million, or 10.9 percent, of total college enrollment of 17.9 million. "Regular" schools include private and public schools; they encompass preprimary and elementary schools and schooling that would lead to a high school diploma or a college degree. Census data are not collected on enrollment in specialized programs such as vocational or technical training and English-language instruction that might serve significant numbers of foreign-born adults.

The impact of immigration on school enrollment is greater than that implied by the numbers of foreign-born children and youth because immigrants give birth to children in the United States, who then enter the school system. Direct measurement of this impact is not possible from the 1990 Census because a question on place of birth of parents was not asked. An alternative estimate is possible by comparing the number of (native-born and foreign-born) persons aged 5 to 17 who are reported not to speak English "very well" with the total enrollment in elementary and high schools. This comparison indicates that the 2.4 million such persons would account for 5.6 percent of elementary and high school enrollment. By assuming that all limited-English speakers aged 5 to 17 are enrolled in school, this calculation is biased in an upward direction. Of course, some immigrants arrive from countries where English is commonly spoken, so their effect on school enrollment is not captured by this estimation method.

Children and Youth With Limited Proficiency in English

According to the census, 6.3 million persons aged 5 to 17 speak a language other than English at home; fully 74.8 percent, or 4.7 million, of them are native-born citizens. The 6.3 million figure may be the best indicator of the indirect impact of immigration on school enrollments, although not all these young people are necessarily the first generation born to immigrant parents, and it excludes immigrants from homes where English is spoken. The fact that a language other than English is spoken in the home does not mean that all these children need special instruction at school. Most of them are bilingual. Only 37.8 percent of them (2.4 million) are characterized as not speaking English very well. Again, a majority (65.6 percent or 1.6 million) were born in the United States, leaving only 820,000 foreign-born persons aged 5 to 17 who do not speak English very well. This core population is of school age immigrants who may need special services; 87.3 percent of them live in "linguistically isolated" households, defined as households in which no one speaks English very well.

Adults With Limited Proficiency in English

The 1990 Census reports that 25.5 million people aged 18 and over speak a language other than English at home. More than half of them are foreign-born persons (54.2 percent or 13.8 million people). As with the children, most of them (54.6 percent) are bilingual. Considering only the 11.6 million adults who are reported as not speaking English very well, 8.3 million, or 72.0 percent, are foreign-born. This population of 11.6 million foreign-born and native-born adults might be treated as a measure of the potential need for English language classes for adults, although not all such persons seek formal language training. The Census does not collect data on enrollment in language classes or other training outside the regular academic curriculum, so no direct calculation is possible from this source of the impact of immigration on adult education.

U.S. Department of Education

Impact of Immigrant Students on the U.S. Educational System

For more than 200 years, the United States has been highly successful in welcoming new immigrants and providing them with the opportunity to prosper and make a contribution to the growth of this country. Our greatness, in no small share, is the product of the blood, sweat, tears, and wisdom of these immigrants. Today, the challenge of providing new immigrants with the opportunity they seek is greater than ever before. The basic educational requirements for meaningful employment have increased enormously over the last 50 years. Quality employment now requires a sophistication with the English language and a range of technical competencies that were unnecessary just a few decades ago. This challenge is further heightened by the current rate of immigration. During the decade of the 1980's, immigration reached its highest point since the decade beginning in 1905. The magnitude of this latest wave of immigration has had the greatest impact on the educational systems of the six States where 76 percent of new immigrants reside—California, New York, Texas, Florida, New Jersey, and Illinois.

While most of these immigrants entered the United States legally, a small but significant number were undocumented. Recently Congress debated legislation to permit States to deny education to students who are not legally present in this country. President Clinton strongly opposed this legislation because it would punish innocent children for the actions of their parents. Such a measure is also shortsighted because it would not help solve the illegal immigration problem; instead, it would create a new class of illiterate children in America by pushing them out of the schoolhouse and into the streets.

High rates of immigration create a significant burden, particularly on the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. The cost of providing public education is underwritten by local property tax revenues and, to a lesser extent, by State and Federal funds. Recent immigrants frequently earn low wages and, in the short run, contribute less than established residents to the cost of instructing their children. However, a number of Federal programs assist local school districts in meeting this challenge. For example, the Immigrant Education program provides assistance to local educational agencies with concentrations of recent immigrant students. For FY1996 and again in FY1997, the Administration sought to double the appropriation for this program from \$50 million to \$100 million, a request that the Congress accepted for 1997. Similarly, the Department requested increases in other programs—such as the Title I, Education for the Disadvantaged program—that serve large numbers of disadvantaged students, many of whom are recent immigrants.

The subsequent sections provide more detailed information on programs that DOEd administers, which serve significant numbers of immigrant students.

Federally Funded Educational Services for Immigrant Students

The vast majority of educational programs administered by DOE serve students on the basis of educational or financial need. Many of these programs serve significant numbers of recent immigrant students who are not yet proficient in English and are consequently classified as limited English proficient (LEP). At the elementary and secondary level, immigrant students are served under the Title I (Education for the Disadvantaged) Grants to Local Educational Agencies program; the Title I Migrant Education program; and the Bilingual Education program. Many older immigrants are served under the Adult Education program and the Vocational Education Basic State Grants program. At the postsecondary level, federally funded student financial assistance is available to certain noncitizens who intend to become citizens or permanent residents. However, of all the programs administered by the Department, only the Immigrant Education program provides assistance on the basis of immigration status.

Elementary and Secondary Education

In the case of elementary and secondary education programs, educational need is typically defined in terms of academic achievement. For example, in 1995 Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies served an estimated 6 to 8 million low-achieving students, from prekindergarten through grade 12. These students received supplemental instruction to assist them in achieving to the same high standards as all other children. In 1995, an estimated 1.2 million students who received these services were LEP. While some of these students were born in the United States, many were immigrants.

Another program authorized by the Title I legislation provides grants to State educational agencies for educational services for students who are children of migrant agricultural workers and fishermen. In 1995, an estimated 137,000 of some 610,000 students served were identified as LEP. It is likely that many of these students were immigrants.

The Bilingual Education program is the primary program within the Department designed to address the needs of LEP children. In addition, the Immigrant Education program provides services for LEP students who are recent immigrants.

In 1995, the Bilingual Education program served almost 440,000 students. This program provides instructional services to assist students in learning English and achieving to high standards in the academic curriculum. Based on 1991-92 data from a descriptive study of services provided to LEP students, DOE estimates that about 60 percent of the students served by this program were born outside the United States.

As previously mentioned, DOE also administers the Immigrant Education program, which provides grants for supplementary educational services and costs to local educational agencies enrolling substantial numbers of recent immigrants. Immigrant students may be counted for formula allocations under this program only if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than 3 academic years. Participation is limited to districts with at least 500 such students or where immigrant children represent at least 3 percent of the enrollment. Funds are channeled through State educational agencies, which award subgrants to school districts on the basis of the number of immigrant students enrolled. Beginning in FY1996, States could also distribute these funds to local educational agencies through competitive grants. In FY1993, a total of 935 local educational agencies, enrolling more than 798,000 eligible immigrant students, qualified for subgrants under this program. Forty-one percent of these students were enrolled in California schools, while New York schools enrolled 19 percent, and Texas schools enrolled 7 percent. According to State educational agency reports for school year 1993-94, nearly two-thirds of these students were from just 10 countries: Mexico, Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, the former Soviet Union, El Salvador, the Philippines, China, Jamaica, Korea, and Haiti. Table 1 lists the numbers of immigrant students reported by participating States for the period 1992-1996.

Table 2 lists elementary and secondary programs, among others, funded by the Department, that serve large numbers of LEP persons. It also provides data on the estimated number of such persons served and the funds estimated to be used for these services.

Adult and Vocational Education

The FY1995 appropriation for the Vocational Education State Grants program was almost \$973 million. Basic State Grants assist States and outlying areas in expanding and improving their programs of vocational education and provide equal access in vocational education to "special-needs" populations. The populations assisted by Basic State Grants range from adults who need retraining to adapt to changing technological and labor market conditions, to LEP secondary school students. Grant recipients are required by law to make special efforts to ensure that special-needs students (including LEP students, many of whom are likely to be immigrants) have full access to the complete range of vocational education programs and services.

In FY1995, the budget for the Department's Adult Education Grants to States program was more than \$252 million, which supported services to approximately 3.9 million persons. Under this program, adult literacy and high school equivalency instruction is provided through public schools, community colleges, community-based organizations, private businesses, churches, libraries, and labor unions. The Department estimates that 33 percent of the participants in federally funded adult education classes are LEP. It is likely that the great majority of these participants are immigrants.

Table 2 lists adult and vocational programs, among others, funded by the Department, that serve large numbers of LEP persons. It also provides data on the number of such persons served and the funds estimated to be used for these services.

Approximately \$1.6 billion in 1995 funds supported services that benefited about 4.2 million LEP students. These figures do not include student financial aid.

Higher Education

In FY1995, 92 percent of the Department's appropriation for postsecondary education was for student financial aid. The student financial assistance programs authorized by Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, provide student financial aid to needy students who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents.

During the fall of 1992, about 4.1 percent (594,000) of all students enrolled in institutions of postsecondary education were eligible noncitizens. During the same period, about 248,000 eligible noncitizens received assistance under the Department's Title IV student financial assistance programs.

Any student aid applicant who is a permanent resident or has other eligible noncitizen status must provide documentation of that status to receive Title IV student financial aid. Such documentation may be provided automatically through the results of a computer match of information from the financial aid application form and Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) records. If this process fails to confirm the student's status, the institution of higher education must collect additional documentation from the student to verify the student's immigration status.

U.S. Department of Education Programs Serving Limited English Proficient Persons

DOEd operates a variety of programs designed to meet the special instructional needs of LEP children and adults. Approximately \$1.6 billion in 1995 funds supported services that benefited about 4.2 million LEP students. These figures do not include student financial aid.

The Bilingual Education program is the primary program within the Department designed to address the needs of LEP children. In addition, the Immigrant Education program provides services for LEP students who are recent immigrants.

Other programs also serve significant numbers of LEP students. This lists the major programs that served LEP students in 1995, estimated numbers of such persons, and the estimated amount of funding used to serve them.

TABLE 1.—Students Counted Under the Immigrant Education Program: FYs1992-1996

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Arizona	16,001	16,985	18,150	19,463	26,312
California	348,142	338,480	317,174	277,232	251,307
Colorado	3,594	4,114	4,370	5,062	6,631
Connecticut	4,929	4,422	4,331	4,522	3,906
District of Columbia	6,485	4,211	4,306	4,097	3,368
Florida	33,275	43,130	47,034	65,705	97,657
Georgia	4,215	4,659	6,543	6,638	9,518
Hawaii	3,162	3,489	3,720	3,418	3,102
Idaho	1,380	2,009	2,778	3,109	3,686
Illinois	39,074	42,718	45,595	59,764	61,585
Iowa	786	1,244	1,212	1,410	2,430
Kansas	2,195	2,180	2,254	3,542	4,653
Louisiana	3,387	2,897	2,336	2,555	2,499
Maine	255	311	297	349	443
Maryland	13,268	13,201	11,593	11,460	8,643
Massachusetts	17,074	16,342	17,294	16,606	18,717
Michigan	3,618	3,984	4,677	6,121	6,379
Minnesota	2,997	3,530	3,528	3,533	4,192
Missouri	2,174	1,804	1,996	1,900	2,380
Montana	155	162	237	173	191
Nebraska	291	1,045	1,209	2,044	2,370
Nevada	0	2,511	5,884	3,932	4,794
New Jersey	23,592	23,850	26,618	28,679	28,344
New Mexico	5,392	7,155	7,890	8,183	9,487
New York	139,626	158,767	146,664	147,840	149,932
North Carolina	0	0	0	0	286
North Dakota	320	544	327	380	363
Ohio	1,975	1,885	2,074	2,046	1,983
Oklahoma	1,032	1,278	1,265	1,592	1,857
Oregon	5,369	5,169	5,091	5,436	5,782
Pennsylvania	4,255	4,463	3,799	4,631	4,605
Puerto Rico	3,528	3,500	3,292	3,515	3,625
Rhode Island	7,933	8,727	8,891	9,128	9,279
Tennessee	1,718	1,620	1,749	2,109	2,179
Texas	41,332	55,911	54,390	60,422	83,935
Utah	8,148	8,909	9,278	8,653	8,580

TABLE 1.—Students Counted Under the Immigrant Education Program: FYs1992-1996 (continued)

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Vermont	161	169	168	34	155
Virginia	11,898	12,404	11,413	11,408	10,990
Washington	13,565	14,669	16,017	16,142	16,824
Wisconsin	1,285	1,089	1,426	2,147	2,068
Virgin Islands	0	2,449	2,412	1,947	1,712
Territories	922	0	0	5,157	7,854
Total	778,508	825,986	809,282	822,084	874,603

TABLE 2.—Major Programs That Served LEP Students in FY1995

	Estimated Number of LEP Students Served	Estimated FY1995 Funds (\$000)
I. Programs with the primary purpose of serving LEP students		
Bilingual Education	441,000	\$156,700
The Bilingual Education program is designed to build local capacity to provide appropriate instructional services to LEP students so that these programs will continue once Federal funds are reduced or no longer available. Grants assist school districts to establish, operate, or improve educational programs for LEP students. Awards to institutions of higher education and others support teacher training. The estimates above represent all LEP students served by the Bilingual Education program and are based on data from 1992 grantees.		
Immigrant Education	822,000	\$50,000
This program provides formula grants to States for subgrants to school districts that enroll substantial numbers of recent immigrant students. Virtually all these students are LEP persons. The student estimate is the total number of eligible immigrants reported by States in their 1995 applications.		
II. Other programs that devote significant resources to serving LEP students		
Title I Grants to LEAs	1,156,000	\$1,144,000
This program supports supplementary education services, provided by local school districts to children who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet State academic standards. A significant number of children served have limited proficiency in English. The dollar and child estimates are derived from 1993 program data.		
Title I Migrant Program	137,000	\$76,000
This program provides funds to States for compensatory education services to children of migrant agricultural workers and fishermen. Nearly 75 percent of all the program's participants are Hispanic and a significant number lack English proficiency. Estimates of LEP funding and of the number of LEP children served are derived from program data.		

TABLE 2.—Major Programs That Served LEP Students in FY1995 (continued)

	Estimated Number of LEP Students Served	Estimated FY1995 Funds (\$000)
Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Grants	109,100	\$46,458
This program provides funds to States for the education of children with disabilities. Approximately 2 percent of the children served lack proficiency in English; this estimate is based on data provided in the 1990 Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey and State data for the 1992-93 school year.		
Vocational Rehabilitation Migratory Workers Program	1,400	\$650
The Migratory Workers program makes comprehensive vocational rehabilitation services available to migrant or seasonal farmworkers with vocational disabilities. Emphasis is given to outreach, specialized bilingual rehabilitation counseling, and coordination of vocational rehabilitation services with services from other sources. Most projects supported under this program serve LEP adults.		
Vocational Education Basic State Grants	332,250	\$19,003
This program assists States to expand and improve their programs of vocational education and provide equal access in vocational education to "special-needs" populations. Estimates of the number of LEP adults served are derived from State data collected by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education.		
Adult Education State Programs	1,300,000	\$84,500
This activity provides formula grants to States to assist educationally disadvantaged adults in developing basic literacy skills and achieving certification of high school equivalency. States are required to give special attention to the needs of LEP adults. Estimates of the number of LEP adults served are derived from State data collected by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education.		
Total All Programs	4,196,289	\$1,570,889

This page is intentionally left blank.

Immigration and Social Services

Contributing agencies in order of presentation:

Introduction prepared by:
U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Services
Office of Policy and Planning

From data furnished by:
U.S. Bureau of the Census
Population Division

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Office of the Secretary
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20201

Social Security Administration
Office of Policy
6401 Security Blvd.
Baltimore, Maryland 21235

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Consumer Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, Virginia 22302

Introduction

The impact of immigration on social services in the United States is commonly discussed in fiscal terms: What proportion of the cost of social programs is attributable to the participation of immigrants in those programs? Most of the Federal social programs that serve immigrants are administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the Social Security Administration (SSA), and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). They include mainstream programs such as Medicaid, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), food stamps, and programs targeted at special populations, such as migrant farmworkers or recently arrived refugees. The program descriptions in this chapter were contributed by the departments responsible for them. The descriptions include any provisions that encouraged or limited participation by immigrants during the time periods covered. The program descriptions pertain to a time period before the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996, which made major changes in immigrant eligibility for those programs.

Many of the programs were designed to provide income support for needy persons or to alleviate poverty in other ways. Programs that provide direct benefits to individuals or households usually have eligibility criteria that disqualify persons who are not present legally in the United States. Many of these programs compile data on the immigration status or country of birth of their service populations, making it possible to estimate the cost of benefits paid to noncitizens or to foreign-born persons. Other programs provide a more general range of social services and have not maintained records on the immigration status of persons benefiting from the services.

The 1990 Census contains information regarding the eligibility for, and participation of, foreign-born persons, both citizens and noncitizens, in some social service programs. Census data are available on the sources of household income, including public assistance payments. The Census also provides information on income levels and the prevalence of poverty among foreign-born persons, which provides a measure of eligibility for income-support programs and a context for the program information. That information is summarized here. Table 1 presents several measures of the income of the foreign-born population. For comparison, similar data are displayed for the total U.S. population.

The incomes of foreign-born persons differ greatly by two related measures that may serve as indicators of assimilation: length of time in the United States and citizenship status. For this reason, the tabulations emphasize the contrasts within the foreign-born population. Part of the contrast has to do with age; the median age in 1990 of the foreign-born citizens and of persons who arrived before 1980 was nearly 47 years, while the median age of noncitizens was 32.2 and of persons who arrived during the 1980's was 29.2. The observed income differences, in part, reflect these age differences.

Income Levels

The per capita income of the foreign-born population that entered before 1980 was \$19,423, more than twice that of persons who arrived during the 1980's and substantially higher than the \$14,420 per capita income of the total U.S. population. The contrast is not as great for the median household and family incomes, but the earlier-arriving foreign-born households still maintain an advantage over those who arrived later and a slight advantage over the total population. Immigrants who are not citizens, and especially those who arrived in the 1980's, have particularly low incomes relative to other residents.

Household income distributions give an impression consistent with the average income levels. Looking at households whose income in 1989 was less than \$5,000, only 5.7 percent of households headed by a person who immigrated before 1980 fell into this category, compared with 6.2 percent of all U.S. households and 10.5 percent of households headed by more recent arrivals. At the upper end of the income distribution, 12.2 percent of households headed by a person who arrived before 1980 had incomes in 1989 of \$75,000 or more,

compared with 9.5 percent of all U.S. households and 6.6 percent of households headed by recent immigrants. The analysis by citizenship status gives similar results.

Poverty Status

In 1989, according to Census figures, 13.1 percent of persons living in the United States, and 10 percent of families, had incomes below the poverty level. (Poverty status is determined through a combination of income, family size, and composition.) Persons who immigrated before 1980 were less likely to be impoverished than the general population (12 percent), but families headed by such persons had a slightly higher poverty rate (11 percent). Immigrants and their families who arrived in the 1980's had poverty rates more than double the national average. Again, the analysis by citizenship status yields similar results, except that foreign-born citizens as individuals and as families are less likely to be in poverty than the population as a whole.

Public Assistance Income

The tabulation of sources of household income according to four categories (earnings, social security, public assistance, and retirement income) helps to describe past and present economic activity by different types of households, including their receipt of income transfer payments from social programs. Households headed by foreign-born persons who arrived before 1980 are slightly less likely to have earnings from current wages and more likely to be receiving social security payments than all U.S. households. This and their receipt of retirement income in addition to social security reflects their age structure, with a median age 14 years above that of the general population. These households receive public assistance at a rate slightly higher than that of the general population, 8.9 percent compared with 7.5 percent.

The median age of persons who immigrated during the 1980's is only 3.7 years younger than that of the overall U.S. population, at 29.2, but the income structure of the households they head is in sharp contrast to that of earlier immigrants and the general population. These households are more likely to have earned income and very unlikely to receive social security or retirement income. Despite their earned income, they are also slightly more likely to receive public assistance, at a rate of 9.7 percent. They are slightly less likely than the U.S. population as a whole to have the family structure associated with a propensity to use public assistance: the female householder with no husband present and with children under 18 years of age. Again, the findings by citizenship status are similar to those by period of arrival, except that the income profile of households headed by noncitizens is more consistent with that of an older population with many retired persons.

One possible measure of the impact of immigration on social service programs is the amount of benefits paid to immigrants. In the 1990 Census, households headed by foreign-born persons reported public assistance income in 1989 of \$3.679 billion in the aggregate. Of this amount, \$2.254 billion was paid to households headed by noncitizens. Such income includes payments from the AFDC program, general assistance payments, and SSI payments, but it does not include payments for medical services or the value of food stamps received by the household.

The use of public assistance at these levels by recent immigrants is somewhat unexpected, given the restrictions at the time on access to public assistance by most persons during their first 3 to 5 years in the United States. An analysis of patterns of use of public assistance by immigrants who arrived during the 1980's based on the 1990 census provides some insight into how this situation can occur. The findings are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 1.—Characteristics of Foreign-Born Persons and All Persons in 1990 Census, by Time of Entry and Citizenship

Characteristics	Foreign-Born Population		Total U.S. Population
	Entered 1980's	Entered Pre 1980	
Income/Poverty Measures			
Per capita income	\$9,408	\$19,423	\$14,420
Median household* income	\$24,136	\$30,553	\$30,056
Median family* income	\$24,493	\$35,733	\$35,225
Households with income (%):			
Less than \$5,000	10.5%	5.7%	6.2%
\$75,000 or more	6.6%	12.2%	9.5%
Income below poverty level (%):			
Persons	26.3%	12.0%	13.1%
Families	23.4%	11.0%	10.0%
Households with (%):			
Earnings	89.4%	78.5%	80.3%
Social Security income	4.2%	29.0%	26.3%
Public assistance income	9.7%	8.9%	7.5%
Retirement income	2.5%	13.6%	15.6%
Demographic Measures			
Median age (years)	29.2	46.5	32.9
Female householder, no husband present, with own child(ren) under 18 years (% of families):	9.1%	7.4%	6.6%

* A "foreign-born household" is defined as one in which the head of the household is a foreign-born person, so a foreign-born household or family may contain one or more native-born persons.

TABLE 1.—Characteristics of Foreign-Born Persons and All Persons in 1990 Census, by Time of Entry and Citizenship (continued)

Characteristics	Foreign-Born Population		Total U.S. Population
	Entered 1980's	Entered Pre 1980	
Income/Poverty Measures			
Per capita income	\$11,293	\$20,538	\$14,420
Median household* income	\$25,503	\$31,046	\$30,056
Median family* income	\$26,518	\$37,340	\$35,225
Households with income (%):			
Less than \$5,000	9.0%	5.2%	6.2%
\$75,000 or more	7.4%	13.5%	9.5%
Income below poverty level (%):			
Persons	23.3%	10.8%	13.1%
Families	20.7%	8.7%	10.0%
Households with (%):			
Earnings	87.6%	76.0%	80.3%
Social Security income	10.0%	32.8%	26.3%
Public assistance income	10.6%	7.7%	7.5%
Retirement income	4.8%	15.6%	15.6%
Demographic Measures			
Median age (years)	32.2	46.9	32.9
Female householder, no husband present, with own child(ren) under 18 years (% of families):	9.6%	6.1%	6.6%

* A "foreign-born household" is defined as one in which the head of the household is a foreign-born person, so a foreign-born household or family may contain one or more native-born persons.

The 1990 Census data available for this analysis separate the immigrants who arrived during the 1980's into four arrival periods of approximately 2 or 3 years each. Table 2 shows that most of the immigrant households receiving public assistance, 68.1 percent, are headed by persons who arrived before 1980. The percentage of each arrival cohort receiving public assistance does not vary greatly from the overall average of 9.1 percent. The immigrants who arrived in 1980 and 1981 are most likely to receive public assistance, at a level of 11.7 percent. Of the households who arrived in the 1987-1990 period, 8.5 percent received public assistance. These levels of use of public assistance alleviate only part of the poverty among the foreign-born population. Table 2 shows that about one-third of those who arrived in the 1987-1990 period were classified as being in poverty. This proportion dropped for those with longer periods of residence, to a level comparable with that of the total U.S. population, as noted above.

A substantial minority of the householders who arrived during the 1980's and were receiving public assistance are likely to have arrived as refugees, who are exempt from the bar on receiving assistance soon after arrival in the United States. (The census does not ascertain the immigration status of noncitizens, so refugee status is inferred if the householder was born in a country from which most immigrants in the 1980's were first admitted in refugee status. These countries are Cambodia, Cuba, Laos, the Soviet Union, and Vietnam.) More than 45 percent of the foreign-born householders who arrived in the 1987-1990 period or the 1980-1981 period and were receiving public assistance were from these refugee-producing countries. That figure was about 31 percent for similar persons who arrived in the mid-1980's and 15 percent for those who arrived before 1980. Because refugees are admitted for humanitarian reasons and are not required to meet the usual criterion of self-support before being allowed to enter, their reliance on public assistance programs in the early years should not be unexpected.

TABLE 2.—Receipt of Public Assistance Income by Arrival: Cohorts of Foreign-Born Households in the 1990 Census

Item	Total	Arrival Period				
		1987-90	1985-86	1982-84	1980-81	pre-1980
Foreign-born households* (thousands)	7,746.5	593.3	453.2	571.2	699.2	5,429.5
Number with public assistance income (thousands)	706.0	50.4	37.0	55.7	82.0	480.9
Percent with public assistance income	9.1%	8.5%	8.2%	9.8%	11.7%	8.9%
Percent of recipient households from refugee** countries	23.0%	45.4%	31.2%	31.5%	45.6%	15.2%
Income below the poverty level, percent of:						
Persons	18.2%	34.3%	24.0%	20.2%	21.1%	12.0%
Families	14.9%	31.7%	22.1%	19.7%	21.1%	11.0%

*A "foreign-born household" is defined as one in which the head of household is a foreign-born person, so a foreign-born household or family may contain one or more native-born persons. The arrival period is that of the householder.

** Refugee countries are those from which most immigrants since 1980 were first admitted in refugee status.

Other points should be considered in interpreting these data. Because a foreign-born household is defined as one in which the head of the household is a foreign-born person, such a household may contain a mix of foreign- and native-born persons. A household may include more than one family unit, and if any subfamily within it receives public assistance, the entire household will be classified as having public assistance income. In a complex household, it is entirely possible for some members to be eligible for and receiving such assistance while others are not. These data impart an upward bias to the measurement of "households receiving public assistance."

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Summary of Immigration's Impact on HHS Programs

HHS is responsible for providing or financing a wide range of health and social services to individuals residing within the United States. Before passage of PRWORA on August 22, 1996, immigrants were generally eligible for many of these services. Except in a limited number of programs (for example, AFDC and Medicaid), eligibility for most health and social services funded by this department was based primarily on an individual's need for such services regardless of immigrant status. Therefore, reliable data that would allow determination of immigration's impact on HHS administered programs were not ordinarily collected. For example, community health centers provide preventive and primary health care to anyone in need of such services. Because these centers are located in areas that contain medically underserved and disadvantaged populations, they undoubtedly also serve immigrants. However, because receipt of center services has never been based on an individual's immigrant status, the centers do not record or retain information regarding the number of immigrants served. Nevertheless, by providing adequate care, including immunizations, these centers play a significant role in ensuring the health of immigrant communities, as well as maintaining the overall public health.

With the significant exceptions of AFDC, Medicaid, and Medicare, most HHS programs are "closed ended" appropriations. Therefore, in most programs the number of immigrants served has no effect on overall spending levels, which are fixed. Use of services by additional immigrants would generally have no budget impact.

HHS has four notable organizational components that provide services to both citizens and immigrants: the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), the Public Health Service (PHS) agencies, the Administration on Aging (AoA) and the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA). ACF funds a vast array of programs that provide numerous health and social services. For example, Head Start provides comprehensive educational, health, social, nutritional, and other services to low-income, preschool-age children and their families. The Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) and AFDC are two of the major programs administered by ACF and have particular relevance to immigrants.

ORR provides cash, medical assistance, social services, and care for unaccompanied minors to persons who have been admitted into the United States as refugees, political asylees, and Cuban and Haitian entrants. In FY1994, ORR's expenditures for cash and medical assistance totaled approximately \$191.4 million. According to a 1994 survey of recent refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants conducted by ORR, almost one-third of refugee households were self-supporting. Conversely, slightly more than one-third of such households completely depended on public assistance. Other findings concluded that employment increases with length of U.S. residence and use of public assistance by refugees declines as they enter the paid labor force.

Unlike most other HHS programs, eligibility for AFDC, which was the major cash welfare program for low-income families with children before the enactment of PRWORA, is conditional based on legal immigrant status. Undocumented, or illegal, immigrants were not eligible for these welfare benefits. Similarly, sponsored legal immigrants had their eligibility determined by counting some portion of their sponsors' income and resources as being available to them in a procedure known as "sponsor-to-alien deeming." According to administrative data, or "quality control" data, the welfare reciprocity rate for legal immigrants was 5.8 percent of all AFDC recipients in 1994. In addition, according to the 1995 General Accounting Office (GAO) report *Welfare Reform: Implications of Proposals on Legal Immigrants' Benefits*, most households that receive AFDC include both citizen and immigrant recipients.

ACF also provides services to immigrants through a variety of block grants and programs. Among other ACF programs that are relevant to immigrants are the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG), which funds community-based entities such as migrant and seasonal farm-worker organizations and the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), which funds a variety of social service activities. With the enactment of PRWORA, States have been given the option of denying SSBG services to certain categories of immigrants. As mentioned above, most of ACF's programs do not gather and maintain specific information on immigrant use of their services, but it is reasonable to assume that immigrants, in addition to citizens, benefit from these services.

Among the agencies that comprise the PHS, three major agencies provide services to immigrants, as well as citizens: the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). With the exception of the Refugee Mental Health Program and the Refugee Health Assessment Program, eligibility for the other services funded by these PHS organizations is not conditional based on an individual's immigrant status. Accordingly, there is little program information on the use of these services by immigrants, although it is reasonable to assume that immigrants, like citizens, benefit from these services. SAMHSA administers several mental health programs, as well as block grants and demonstration programs, which fund or provide substance abuse and mental health services. CDC funds State and local health departments that provide services, such as various preventive health activities, to individuals. The only criteria for receipt of CDC benefits is the need for health care. The programs supported by HRSA target underserved and disadvantaged populations and fund organizations that provide preventive and primary health care to children and families. Similarly, the only requirement for receiving these services is the need for health care.

AoA is the Federal focal point and advocacy agency for older persons. It works with a nationwide network of offices and agencies to coordinate and develop systems of services for older persons and their caregivers. Among the services its programs provide are: access services, in-home care, community services, and caregiver services. Eligibility for AoA programs and services is not conditional based on immigration status.

HCFA reimburses providers for health services provided to eligible individuals through the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Medicare is a Federal health insurance program for most people age 65 or older and certain people with disabilities. In 1994, Medicare provided more than 38 million individuals with access to health services. Medicare eligibility is based solely on age or disability and past contributions to the Medicare trust fund. HCFA has not collected information regarding citizenship or immigrant status of Medicare recipients because it is generally not relevant to program eligibility or participation. Any individual who does not meet the contribution requirement for Medicare, but does meet the age or disability requirements, may purchase Medicare coverage at an actuarially determined price. Legal immigrants must also satisfy a 5-year residency requirement before being eligible to purchase Medicare coverage. Finally, to the extent Medicare is financed through Medicare tax and premium payments, the payroll taxes paid by younger, first-generation immigrants help support retirees under this system.

Medicaid is a Federal- and State-financed entitlement program that purchases medical assistance for certain low-income families and persons who are aged, blind, or have a disability. Similar to AFDC, eligibility for Medicaid benefits is conditional based on legal immigrant status. Undocumented immigrants are not eligible for Medicaid benefits, except for emergency services. But legal immigrants who otherwise meet the Medicaid eligibility requirements are eligible on the same basis as citizens. In 1994, an estimated 35.1 million individuals were enrolled in Medicaid. However, the Federal Government has never required States to submit data regarding the number of legal immigrants enrolled. Therefore, there is no reliable estimate of the number of immigrants receiving Medicaid.

HHS provides or funds a wide array of social and health services to promote the public health and well being of millions of individuals and families residing in the United States. HHS programs have been crucial in improving the overall quality of life of families and communities over the last several decades. Many HHS programs and services have been available to children, families, the elderly, and the disabled who have been in need of various types of assistance without regard to their citizenship or immigrant status. Because of the lack of quantitative data on program participation of immigrants or the demand for services among this population, it is difficult to determine immigration's impact on HHS programs and services over the past 7 years. However, as indicated above, and based on the limited data available, immigrants do not appear to substantially affect HHS program spending levels.

The enactment of welfare reform on August 22, 1996, significantly changed the status of legal immigrants and their eligibility for certain major assistance programs. For the first time legal immigrants will be treated much differently than citizens when it comes to eligibility for assistance under certain cash, health, and social services programs. For example, most legal immigrants will be ineligible for the Food Stamp Program (FSP), which is administered by the USDA, solely because of their immigrant status. The need for nutritional assistance is no longer sufficient for Federal assistance.

In addition, AFDC, which was once a joint Federal and State cash entitlement program for low-income children and families administered by HHS, is now being transformed into a capped block grant program providing funds to States, which now have the flexibility to determine how assistance will be provided for, and to which, needy families. This new block grant program is called Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). The new welfare law allows States to determine whether or not to provide TANF assistance to most legal immigrants, known as qualified aliens. States also have the option to determine if qualified aliens are eligible for services under the Medicaid program and the SSBG program. Although aliens already receiving assistance on August 22, 1996, continue to be eligible for assistance until January 1, 1997, States have the authority to deny assistance under these three programs to most qualified aliens after January 1, 1997.

These new rules that ban most noncitizens from certain Federal assistance programs and allow States to deny other forms of assistance to individuals based solely on their immigrant status represent a significant change in the way legal immigrants have been treated. According to the aforementioned GAO report, quantifying how immigrants will be affected by welfare reform will be difficult, especially because these policy changes may have some effect on immigrants' behavior. Because the law was just enacted, it is too early to determine what those effects may be on immigrants' behavior, and what impacts it will have on HHS programs. Therefore, no attempt to provide statistical estimates will be made at this time. While the effect of these changes on programs is unclear and the number of immigrants that will be affected cannot be quantified precisely, these changes should have a significant impact on needy immigrants, including children, elderly, and the disabled. Relevant data will be provided to Congress in future reports.

HHS Programs and Services

Administration for Children and Families

Office of Refugee Resettlement

The Federal Government, through ORR, funds and administers programs for persons who have been admitted into the United States with refugee status, for those who have been granted political asylum, and for Cuban and Haitian entrants. (Refugees, asylees, and entrants are collectively called refugees in the subsequent program descriptions.) The primary objective of these programs is to help refugees become self-sufficient as quickly as possible after their arrival in the United States. Because refugees, by definition, are legal residents, their use of benefits and services, as described below, will have an impact on Federal social service programs.

Agency Summary

Federal resettlement assistance to refugees is provided primarily through a State-administered refugee resettlement program. States are responsible for planning, administering, and coordinating refugee resettlement activities. Services and activities available to refugees include cash and medical assistance, social services, and care of unaccompanied minors. More detailed information on ORR programs appears in the Report to the Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program, which is published annually.

Cash and Medical Assistance

Many working-age refugees from all parts of the world are able to find employment soon after arrival in their new communities. For those who need services before placement in jobs, short-term financial support may be available through the local resettlement agency. However, when refugees require additional time, assistance, and training beyond short-term support, they may apply for help from the State-administered cash and medical assistance programs, which are supported with Federal funds.

Refugees are eligible to apply for cash assistance benefits under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act or the SSI programs and may participate as long as they continue to meet program eligibility requirements. Refugees who qualify for AFDC or SSI also become eligible for Medicaid benefits. Refugees also may be eligible for the Medicaid medically needy program if they have incomes slightly above that required for AFDC and SSI eligibility and incur medical expenses that bring their net income down to the State Medicaid eligibility level.

The Refugee Act of 1980, as codified in the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), permits ORR to reimburse States for Title IV-A payments made to refugees, for Medicaid costs incurred on a refugee's behalf, and for refugee SSI costs in those States that supplement Federal SSI payments. This reimbursement period, originally limited to 36 months, was reduced to 31 months in 1986, 24 months in 1988, and 4 months in 1990. Since 1990, ORR appropriations have not been sufficient to continue reimbursing States for these costs.

Some refugees do not qualify for cash assistance under the Title IV-A or SSI programs because they do not meet the categorical eligibility criteria. These refugees may receive special cash assistance called Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), which is provided at the same level as AFDC. As with the previously programs, the original period of eligibility was limited to 36 months after entry into the United States. The period of eligibility was reduced to 18 months in FY1982, 12 months in FY1989, and 8 months in FY1992. The RCA eligibility period has remained stable at 8 months.

In all States, refugees eligible for RCA are also eligible for Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA) for the same period as RCA. Refugees also may be eligible for RMA alone if they have incomes slightly above that required for cash assistance eligibility and incur medical expenses that bring their net income down to the Medicaid eligibility level. States are reimbursed for RMA costs.

After the period of eligibility for RCA and RMA has expired, refugees who continue to be ineligible for Title IV-A, SSI, or Medicaid may qualify for State- or locally-funded General Assistance (GA) programs on the same basis as other residents of the locality in which they reside. Similarly, refugees not eligible for Medicaid or no longer eligible for RMA may be eligible for State- or locally-funded General Medical Assistance (GMA) programs. The Federal Government previously reimbursed States for their GA and GMA costs for a period of months after entry into the United States but, since 1990, appropriations have not been sufficient to allow ORR to provide such reimbursement.

In FY1994, the cash and medical assistance expenditures were approximately \$191.4 million. Table 3 provides information on funds appropriated for ORR programs, refugee admissions, time-eligible populations, and period of eligibility for FY1981 through FY1995.

TABLE 3.—Refugee Appropriations, Admissions, Time-Eligible Population, and Period of Eligibility (Months): FYs1981 to 1995

Fiscal Year	Appropriation (dollars)	Admissions Actual ¹	36-Month Population ²	AFDC/SSI Medicaid ³	RCA RMA ³	GA GMA ³
1981	901,652,000	159,252	477,731	1-36	1-36	0
1982	689,747,000	97,355	474,003	1-36	1-18	19-36
1983	585,000,000	60,036	316,898	1-36	1-18	19-36
1984	541,761,000	70,601	228,966	1-36	1-18	19-36
1985	444,372,000	67,167	200,203	1-36	1-18	19-36
1986	315,812,000	60,544	198,322	1-31	1-18	19-31
1987	339,597,000	58,857	186,578	1-31	1-18	19-31
1988	346,933,000	76,191	196,330	1-31	1-18	19-31
1989	382,356,000	106,886	242,662	1-31	1-18	19-31
1990	389,758,000	122,939	306,744	1-24	1-12	13-24
1991	410,623,000	113,989	343,814	1-4	1-12	0
1992	410,630,000	131,767	368,695	0	1-8	0
1993	381,481,000	119,084	364,840	0	1-8	0
1994	389,218,000	112,136	362,987	0	1-8	0
1995	413,786,000	110,000	341,220	0	1-8	0

¹ Includes Amerasians and their accompanying family members; entry for FY1994 is the admission ceiling

² Refugees and Amerasians residing in the United States 36 months or less

³ Months of ORR reimbursement after arrival in the United States

⁴ Admissions and 36-month population for FY1995 are estimates based on FY1995 admission ceiling

Unaccompanied Minors

Resettlement of unaccompanied minor refugees who require foster care upon their arrival in the United States is provided through two national voluntary agencies, the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) and the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS). These agencies place the refugee children in licensed child welfare programs operated by their local affiliates.

Unaccompanied minor refugees are eligible for the same general range of child welfare benefits available to nonrefugee children in the State. They are placed in home foster care, group care, independent living, or residential treatment. States receive Federal reimbursement for costs incurred on their behalf until the month after the 18th birthday or such higher age as is permitted under the State's child welfare plan (Title IV-B of the Social Security Act).

Social Services

Federal funding is available to States for a broad range of social services to refugees. Currently, about 85 percent of the social service funds are allocated directly to States according to their proportion of all refugees who arrived in the United States during the 3 previous fiscal years. States with small refugee populations receive at least \$75,000 in social service funds.

States use most of their social service funds for employment-related services, such as English language training, employment counseling, job placement, and vocational training. States may also provide services identified in a State's program under Title XX of the Social Security Act and certain services listed in ORR policy instructions to States, such as orientation, translation, social adjustment, transportation, and daycare.

Discretionary Projects

The remaining social service funds are used for a variety of initiatives and individual projects intended to contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of refugee resettlement service delivery. During FYs 1991-1994, major discretionary projects included the following:

- A special initiative that targets refugees in five States and two California counties with high refugee welfare dependency rates or large numbers of refugees on welfare. ORR provides financial support to enable the States to implement individualized plans to change the service delivery system to increase employment and reduce welfare dependency among targeted populations in selected communities.
- The Microenterprise Development Initiative assists refugees in starting or expanding small businesses through training in business skills, access to credit, and individualized business technical assistance.
- The Planned Secondary Resettlement program helps unemployed refugees relocate from areas of high welfare dependency to communities with favorable employment prospects.
- The Preferred Communities program assists national voluntary agencies to defray the costs associated with resettling arriving refugees in communities with good job opportunities and with reducing the number of refugees placed in high-impact sites.
- Grants for specialized services are awarded to the almost 71,000 Amerasian youths and their accompanying family members who have arrived in the United States since 1988.
- The Community and Family Strengthening program supports services to strengthen communities and families. These grants offer increased services to women, crime prevention services for refugee youth, parent-child literacy, in-home counseling services for spousal and child abuse, services to victims of domestic violence, and the establishment of local community centers.
- The Unanticipated Arrivals program enables communities to respond to the arrival of new ethnic populations of refugees and entrants, particularly where the existing services systems do not have appropriate bilingual capacity or cannot respond adequately because available funds have already been obligated.

Targeted Assistance

This program provides employment services to refugees and entrants who reside in counties with unusually large concentrations of refugees and entrants and a high use of public assistance. The substantial need of these populations for services has necessitated supplementation of local service resources.

In addition to the county-targeted assistance program, Florida has received funds to provide health care to eligible Cuban/Haitian entrants and to the Dade County public school system to support education for entrant children.

Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program

This program provides an alternative to the federally funded, State-administered programs. Federal funds of up to \$1,000 per refugee are available, on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis, to voluntary agencies participating in the program. The goal is to help refugees attain self-sufficiency within 4 months after arrival. Matching grants fund a range of activities, including case management, employment services, maintenance assistance, and support services, such as English language training and health services.

Because of significant increases in the numbers of arriving Jewish refugees from the former Soviet Union who are traditionally served by this program, matching grant appropriations have increased substantially in recent years, from \$5.8 million in FY1987 to \$32.6 million in FY1994.

Refugee Preventive Health

Refugees often have health problems resulting from poor living conditions and a lack of medical care in their countries of origin or during their flight and wait for resettlement. Health care services are available to refugees in first-asylum camps, refugee processing centers, and after a refugee's arrival in the United States.

Medical and other volunteers treat refugee health problems and work to improve the general health conditions in refugee camps. Public health advisors from CDC are stationed in Southeast Asia and Europe to monitor the quality of health screening for U.S.-bound refugees. At U.S. ports-of-entry, refugees and their medical records are inspected by PHS Quarantine Officers who also notify the appropriate State and local health departments of the refugees' arrival.

The medical problems of refugees, while not necessarily constituting a public health hazard, might adversely affect their successful resettlement and employment. CDC awards grants to State and local health agencies to medically screen and identify health problems of newly arriving refugees that might impair their effective resettlement, employability, and eventual self-sufficiency and to refer refugees with such problems for treatment.

Impact of Immigration on ORR Programs

Although a person may meet the criteria for admission into the United States as a refugee, the existence of the U.S. refugee admissions program does not automatically entitle that individual to enter the United States. The annual admissions program is a legal mechanism for admitting an applicant who is among those persons for whom the United States has a special concern and otherwise is eligible. The need for resettlement, not the desire of a refugee to enter the United States, is a governing principle in the management of the U.S. refugee program.

Refugees arrive through a highly regulated process. Although crisis events that increase the flow of refugees may be unpredictable, refugees are admitted to the United States through a procedure that balances foreign policy considerations against perceived domestic concerns, such as unemployment and housing shortages. The refugee resettlement process is considerably more controlled than the arrival of immigrants, who have outnumbered refugee arrivals in recent years by a magnitude of seven or eight to one, because a high proportion of immigrants are immediate relatives of U.S. citizens and not regulated by the immigration quota system.

From FYs1992-1994, the United States admitted approximately 394,979 refugees, Amerasian immigrants and Cuban/Haitian entrants, compared with 343,831 in the previous 3-year period (FYs1989-1991). These persons came from more than 30 countries, with the largest number arriving from the republics of the former Soviet Union. In FY1994, about 43,125 Soviet refugees arrived, down by about one-third from the peak year of FY1992 (61,018), but far above the low of 743 refugee arrivals in FY1986.

In FY1994, Vietnamese arrivals (including Amerasian immigrants) decreased to about 36,995 from 42,500 the year before. Also declining significantly were arrivals from Ethiopia whose nearly 297 arrivals in FY1994 were only one-tenth of the annual arrivals in the early 1990's. Similarly, Iranian arrivals in FY1994 (859) measured only one-eighth of the peak of 6,624 in FY1987.

Offsetting these declines are significant gains from other countries. From FYs1983-1991, Somalian, Sudanese, and Liberian arrivals together numbered 277. During the latest 3-year period (FYs1992-1994), refugees from these African nations soared to 11,555. Iraqi arrivals rose 13-fold to 13,000 from the previous 3-year period (FYs1989-1991). Arrivals from the republics of the former Yugoslavia rose to approximately 7,400 in FY1994, compared with only 3 in FY1992.

The largest increase in arrivals were recorded from the Caribbean region. Haitian arrivals, primarily entrants, soared to 17,500, compared with only 1 in the previous 3-year period (FYs1989-1991). Cuban arrivals, also primarily entrants, doubled to over 29,000 during the past 3 years (FYs1992-1994).

Because of these developments, the trend in refugee arrivals has been upward during the 3-year period from FYs1992-1994. However, the FY1994 arrivals of 126,475 are low compared with the peak year of 1980, when 166,727 refugees arrived. Table 4 illustrates the trends in admissions from different parts of the world from FYs1983-1995.

Refugees arriving in the United States are placed in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and several territories. The placement process manages to spread the impact of refugees around the country. Refugees are generally not placed in a location that already has a high refugee population unless they have a close relative residing in the area. Because most recent refugees have been joining relatives who became established earlier, their distribution still does not parallel that of the overall U.S. population.

Table 5 shows the number of refugees and Amerasian immigrants resettled in each State during FY1994 and Table 6 shows the initial resettlement of Cuban and Haitian entrants from FYs1992-1995. From FYs1992-1994, California received 23 percent of all new arrivals, and New York ranked second with 18 percent. From FYs1989-1991, these two States received 28 percent and 17 percent of arrivals, respectively. Also in the earlier period, Florida received 5 percent of all arrivals. From FYs1992-1994, its numbers soared to almost 40,250, and its proportion doubled to 10 percent of all arrivals. Arrivals to Florida rose sharply again in FY1995 to more than 30,700, almost 23 percent of all arrivals to the United States.

The nationality composition of the refugee population arriving in each State varies considerably, depending, in part, on the residence patterns established by earlier refugees and immigrants. While most States have received a majority of Southeast Asians recently, some States have received mostly refugees from other countries. The example of the Cuban refugees in Florida is well known. New York, California, and Illinois receive many Soviet and Eastern European refugees; Michigan receives large numbers of refugees from Eastern Europe and the Near East, and several small States have received a predominance of refugees from one or two countries.

TABLE 4.—Refugee, Entrant, and Amerasian Arrivals by Country of Citizenship: FYs1983-1995

Country	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	83-95
Afghanistan	2,790	2,021	2,200	2,418	3,161	2,211	1,741	1,595	1,443	1,465	1,234	24	13	22,316
Albania	56	42	44	82	47	74	42	104	1,339	1,168	397	159	49	3,603
Bulgaria	137	139	125	151	108	149	105	345	563	102	23	26	6	1,969
Cambodia	13,041	19,727	19,175	9,845	1,786	2,897	2,167	2,328	179	162	61	15	6	71,384
Cuba	617	87	180	143	292	3,365	4,170	4,706	4,188	6,654	6,870	15,468	37,037	83,777
Czechoslovakia	1,227	22	948	1,427	1,031	661	910	331	153	16	1	3	0	7,530
Ethiopia	2,544	2,517	1,739	1,265	1,800	1,447	1,723	3,144	4,085	2,927	2,710	297	192	26,360
Haiti	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	10,440	1,945	5,043	2,551	19,984
Hungary	644	544	520	653	664	771	1,054	259	12	2	0	1	0	5,124
Iran	902	2,867	3,421	3,203	6,624	6,235	4,835	3,100	2,650	1,964	1,155	859	973	38,783
Iraq	1,583	167	232	305	196	40	103	66	822	4,375	4,560	4,930	3,475	19,847
Laos	2,907	7,218	5,195	12,313	13,394	14,597	12,560	8,715	9,232	7,285	6,945	6,211	3,682	110,254
Liberia	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	620	946	590	55	2,217
Libya	0	0	5	1	2	2	1	1	344	1	0	0	0	357
Nicaragua	0	0	0	0	36	201	341	634	194	18	60	13	13	1,510
Poland	5,508	4,300	2,822	3,577	3,406	3,308	3,576	1,629	371	165	52	43	23	28,780
Romania	3,741	4,293	4,456	2,588	2,999	2,833	3,276	4,071	4,533	1,510	230	81	32	34,643
Somalia	0	1	0	0	2	6	45	17	119	1,528	2,695	3,508	2,526	10,447
Sudan	4	0	3	0	2	1	6	59	6	126	253	1,289	1,694	3,443
USSR	1,371	730	647	793	3,458	20,020	39,387	49,742	38,496	61,018	48,354	43,125	35,509	342,650
Vietnam ¹	22,819	24,856	25,222	21,703	19,661	17,571	21,924	27,796	28,385	26,856	31,405	34,107	32,250	334,555
Amerasian ²	0	0	0	0	3	363	8,720	13,916	16,580	17,140	11,220	2,888	948	71,778
Yugoslavia	10	25	22	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	1,877	7,418	9,872	19,239
Zaire	11	31	30	11	9	7	20	70	39	63	199	83	115	688
Other ³	124	235	181	77	179	152	200	339	351	350	354	294	283	3,019
Total	60,036	70,601	67,167	60,557	58,862	76,921	106,906	122,939	113,986	144,958	123,546	126,475	131,304	1,264,258

¹ Refugees only; Amerasians and accompanying family members listed separately

² Thirteen Amerasians listed their country of citizenship as Cambodia in 1991, and another eight Amerasians listed their country of citizenship as Cambodia in 1992. All 21 were assigned to the category of Amerasian.

³ Includes countries with fewer than 100 arrivals in any year

TABLE 5.—Refugee, Entrant, and Amerasian Arrivals by Country of Citizenship and State of Initial Resettlement: FY1994

State	Amer. ¹	Vietnam	Laos	Cuba ²	Haiti ²	Iran	Iraq	Ethiopia	Liberia	Somalia	Sudan	USSR ³	Yugo. ⁴	Total
Alabama	54	35	0	3	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	8	194
Alaska	6	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	15	72
Arizona	117	336	0	127	53	12	146	3	0	36	4	157	281	1,284
Arkansas	0	95	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	106
California	358	13,611	3,140	386	79	496	866	80	9	845	91	6,950	638	27,629
Colorado	25	402	29	4	55	4	12	0	0	30	28	539	70	1,202
Conn.	62	190	0	63	106	0	34	2	0	0	2	508	98	1,091
Delaware	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	9	42
Dist. Col.	95	286	0	4	32	15	102	18	18	63	1	0	14	693
Florida	106	760	0	11,207	1,954	11	66	5	0	4	10	574	338	15,080
Georgia	164	1,875	11	49	9	8	39	6	9	308	20	485	336	3,349
Hawaii	14	265	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	286
Idaho	5	96	0	11	44	0	41	0	0	0	0	67	96	373
Illinois	74	580	5	45	53	14	401	13	10	50	24	2,180	932	4,456
Indiana	0	68	0	6	28	2	28	5	0	0	0	138	55	360
Iowa	74	342	3	0	9	0	41	2	0	11	157	34	246	932
Kansas	15	401	10	1	6	2	21	0	2	28	2	123	25	636
Kentucky	84	226	0	15	22	6	82	0	0	34	0	138	195	804
Louisiana	85	520	3	55	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	28	734
Maine	11	0	0	0	0	19	11	2	0	67	44	25	24	202
Maryland	35	400	0	30	135	15	33	2	82	67	30	948	54	1,837
Massach.	11	996	45	23	211	2	97	2	26	174	0	1,565	191	3,373
Michigan	54	368	208	9	153	26	978	0	19	29	0	693	248	2,822
Minnesota	17	550	1,060	12	37	0	21	19	59	140	15	593	107	2,686
Mississippi	0	50	0	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Missouri	115	430	0	85	206	8	217	6	10	59	39	326	360	1,872
Montana	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	28	6	41
Nebraska	24	354	0	0	3	0	85	0	0	0	0	82	35	593
Nevada	0	23	0	346	0	0	6	5	0	12	31	4	39	469
Nevada	0	23	0	346	0	0	6	5	0	12	31	4	39	469
Nevada	0	23	0	346	0	0	6	5	0	12	31	4	39	469
New Hamp.	4	202	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	13	23	252
New Jersey	33	345	0	523	421	4	50	5	44	10	3	982	155	2,599
New Mexico	7	100	0	496	0	0	38	0	0	0	0	20	4	666
New York	128	618	1	241	409	107	207	9	60	137	111	18,080	927	21,139

TABLE 5.—Refugee, Entrant, and Amerasian Arrivals by Country of Citizenship and State of Initial Resettlement: FY1994 (continued)

State	Amer. ¹	Vietnam	Laos	Cuba ²	Haiti ²	Iran	Iraq	Ethiopia	Liberia	Somalia	Sudan	USSR ³	Yugo. ⁴	Total
N. Carolina	112	343	30	9	12	5	5	3	6	59	15	69	111	785
N. Dakota	41	28	0	0	61	0	69	0	0	2	14	35	124	375
Ohio	15	190	40	7	2	7	85	2	8	2	0	1,222	80	1,666
Oklahoma	13	359	0	2	0	2	5	0	12	0	0	0	7	409
Oregon	22	830	9	20	45	4	28	4	0	50	3	848	80	1,962
Penn.	107	475	8	89	215	2	232	19	67	38	12	2,073	221	3,570
R.I.	0	15	41	0	0	0	7	0	53	0	0	142	1	260
S. Carolina	9	113	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	37	9	117
S. Dakota	3	8	0	0	0	0	13	6	0	0	197	38	21	286
Tennessee	100	273	0	0	159	17	183	10	8	148	74	106	102	1,196
Texas	382	3,647	23	416	120	52	286	47	27	206	294	262	432	6,223
Utah	46	242	0	0	0	0	44	0	0	24	40	123	98	620
Vermont	64	73	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	10	110	275
Virginia	68	833	0	7	94	13	59	4	34	593	22	219	139	2,096
Wash.	110	2,094	106	33	134	4	262	18	0	247	6	2,255	263	5,547
W. Virginia	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	17
Wis.	1	22	1,438	3	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	361	58	1,921
Other ⁵	0	0	0	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Total	2,888	34,110	6,211	14,434	4,974	859	4,930	297	590	3,508	1,289	43,140	7,418	125,391

¹ This tabulation includes infants born in the Refugee Processing Center in the Philippines who have been granted Amerasian status retroactively by legislation enacted November 5, 1990.

² Includes entrants

³ Includes refugees from the republics of the former Soviet Union, primarily from Russia

⁴ Includes refugees from the republics of the former Yugoslavia, primarily from Bosnia-Herzegovina

⁵ Includes territories and unknown States

TABLE 6.—Cuban and Haitian Entrant Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FYs1992-1995 ¹

State	Cuba					Haiti				
	1992	1993	1994	1995	92-95	1992	1993	1994	1995	92-95
Alabama	0	1	4	49	54	18	0	0	9	27
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	29	12	117	280	438	1	0	1	7	9
Arkansas	0	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0
California	137	78	263	613	1,091	218	0	2	1	221
Colorado	0	0	3	9	12	0	0	0	0	0
Connecticut	0	2	53	151	206	68	2	5	3	78
Delaware	0	0	0	2	2	9	3	0	0	12
District of Columbia	2	0	0	10	12	1	0	0	0	1
Florida	2,183	3,198	10,488	25,222	41,091	8,397	567	1,419	659	11,042
Georgia	5	2	39	152	198	40	0	0	0	40
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	2	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	22	16	34	219	297	70	0	0	0	70
Indiana	3	0	6	6	15	3	0	0	0	3
Iowa	2	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0
Kansas	0	2	1	8	11	1	0	0	0	1
Kentucky	4	1	12	151	169	10	0	0	3	13
Louisiana	2	7	53	164	226	47	0	1	4	52
Maine	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	2	0	5	109	116	63	6	5	16	90
Massachusetts	10	8	23	39	80	260	15	40	38	353
Michigan	6	10	9	140	165	15	0	0	27	42
Minnesota	0	0	1	18	19	0	1	0	0	1
Mississippi	0	0	8	13	21	0	0	1	11	12
Missouri	0	1	10	14	25	8	0	0	0	8

TABLE 6.—Cuban and Haitian Entrant Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FYs1992-1995¹ (continued)

State	Cuba					Haiti				
	1992	1993	1994	1995	92-95	1992	1993	1994	1995	92-95
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	70	87	289	362	817	18	1	0	0	19
New Hampshire	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	92	62	309	791	1,254	297	8	13	4	322
New Mexico	105	135	378	417	1,035	0	0	0	0	7
New York	38	48	184	718	988	590	70	74	29	763
North Carolina	6	0	4	17	27	13	0	0	0	13
North Dakota	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	3
Ohio	0	0	8	12	20	38	0	0	0	38
Oklahoma	0	1	2	10	13	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	1	22	219	242	54	3	11	19	87
Pennsylvania	4	5	19	89	119	72	5	2	20	99
Rhode Island	0	0	0	3	3	11	0	0	0	11
South Carolina	2	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	2	7	0	53	62	16	5	0	0	21
Texas	73	62	367	505	1,007	22	4	0	0	26
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	0	1	8	154	163	19	2	2	9	32
Washington	0	1	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	1	0	4	9	14	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown ²	10	21	48	150	229	4	1	1	0	6
Total	2,811	3,772	12,781	30,920	50,284	10,383	693	1,577	862	13,515

¹ Does not include Cuban and Haitian arrivals with refugee status

² Includes unknown States

Demographic Impact

Although refugees constitute a small portion of total immigration, to the extent that refugees differ from immigrants in their characteristics, their impact can be substantially different. Most refugee groups in recent years have been considerably younger than the resident population of the United States and younger than other immigrants as well. The median age of arriving Southeast Asian refugees has generally been between 16 and 24 years of age. Other recent refugee groups average from early to midtwenties, with the exception of Soviet refugees. The average age of refugees from the former Soviet Union has been in the early thirties.

A young refugee population has a disproportionate impact on certain institutions, such as local school systems. In areas where refugees settle in large numbers, many children from homes where English is not used enter the public school system. This enrollment creates a need for special teaching approaches and, where the numbers are particularly high, for extra classrooms and teachers. Many young refugee adults seek English language training in community colleges or similar programs, and Federal refugee social services grants often fund this type of training.

The youthfulness of the refugee population at time of arrival may actually facilitate their successful labor market incorporation. The contraction of the domestic supply of teenagers and young adults has made it possible for many local labor markets to accommodate growing numbers of young refugee workers. Evidence suggests that adjustment to a host labor market may also be easiest when it occurs early in one's working life.

At the other end of the age spectrum, the small number of elderly refugees means that this population currently makes few demands on major programs for retirees, such as Social Security and Medicare. While about 1 out of 8 Americans is currently aged 65 or older, only about 1 out of 14 arriving refugees is in that age group. By the time most of today's refugees are ready to retire, they will have contributed for years to the nation's Social Security, Medicare, and other pension systems.

Economic Impact

The economic impact of refugee arrivals depends on many factors, such as their work skills and English language ability, the labor markets in the areas in which they are resettled, and the availability of special programs to ease their transition into the U.S. labor force. Refugees settling in regions of low unemployment may find the labor market fairly receptive to their skills. However, some refugees settle in labor-surplus areas, such as California's Central Valley. In this case, their economic impact may not be positive.

In the short term, the primary question is if refugees are obtaining employment that enables them to become self-sufficient. ORR conducts an annual native-language survey of refugees, entrants, and Amerasian immigrants who have come to the United States during the 5 previous years. The most recently published survey, conducted in October 1994 includes interviews with 1,751 refugee households. Survey results reveal the following:

- Employment increases with length of residence in the United States.
- Use of public assistance varies widely among refugee households.

Results from the 1994 survey indicate that the employment-to-population ratio (EPR) of refugees 16 or older who have come to the United States during the 5 previous years was 35.4 percent, compared with an equivalent rate of 63.2 percent for the overall U.S. population. As in previous years, the EPR rose with length of residence in the United States. The survey reported an EPR of 28.3 percent for refugees in the United States equal to or less than 12 months and an EPR of 43.7 percent for refugees in the United States more than 4 years.

The 1994 survey also indicates that 30.5 percent of refugee households were self-supporting, although often at low income levels. About 12.7 percent of households were among the ranks of the working poor, having some earned income, but still qualifying for public assistance. Slightly more than one-third (34.4 percent) of

the refugee households had no earned income and depended entirely on public assistance. The remaining refugee households received neither assistance nor earned income in the month of the survey. Household receipt of public assistance reflects not only problems in finding employment, but also differences in need and ability. Assistance-only households are significantly larger than nonrecipient households (4.3 vs. 3.8 individuals) and also have fewer wage earners and fewer fluent English speakers than such households. Of the sampled households with no earned income, 59.9 percent had at least one child under 16 years of age.

Refugees often are responsible for improving economic conditions in communities where they settle. Miami's economic rebirth is usually credited to the Cuban refugees who arrived beginning in the early 1960's. More recently, the Vietnamese refugees who began arriving in 1975 have revitalized commercial neighborhoods in many cities by establishing restaurants, specialty shops, and other businesses. Precise measures of the economic contributions of refugees are not available.

Geographic Distribution

Just as arriving immigrants in past years tended to concentrate and form ethnic communities in certain areas, so have recent refugees. About three-quarters of all Southeast Asian refugees since 1975 have resettled in just 10 States. Thirty percent reside in California alone. The size of current refugee communities will continue to grow with admission of additional family members because of reunification cases.

The more than 767,000 refugees from areas outside Southeast Asia who have arrived since 1975 have resettlement patterns more spread out than the Indochinese. This trend has tended to diffuse the impact of refugee arrivals upon local communities. Large numbers of the non-Indochinese refugees have resettled in cities in the Northeast and the Midwest. Of the non-Indochinese refugees who arrived from FYs1975-1994, New York received the largest number, about 145,000, with California in second place with around 124,000, and Florida third with about 58,000.

The ethnic composition of States' refugee populations varies widely. Sixty-one percent of the arrivals since 1975 have been Indochinese. Nine States resettled a population of more than 90 percent Indochinese, while only four States resettled a refugee population composed of more than 50 percent non-Indochinese. New York had the highest proportion of non-Indochinese refugee arrivals (77 percent), followed by Florida (69 percent), New Jersey (58 percent), and Maryland (53 percent).

As the ethnic composition of the arriving refugee population shifts in response to new needs, so will the geographic placement patterns of these new arrivals. During FYs1992-1994, 36.5 percent of arrivals were Southeast Asian, compared with 44 percent from FYs1989-1991 and 65 percent during the previous 5 years. The increase in refugees from Cuba, Haiti, Iraq, Somalia, the former Yugoslavia, and the former Soviet Union has been especially strong. If this trend continues, States that already have concentrations of refugees from those areas should expect increases in their share of total arrivals.

The impact of refugees should be placed in the context of total legal immigration. Nationwide in FY1987, there were 10 persons admitted as immigrants for every 1 person newly arriving as a refugee. Since FY1987, refugee admissions have risen sharply, from 58,862 in FY1987 to 126,475 in FY1994. Legal immigration has also risen, so that the proportion of legal immigrants to refugees throughout this period was seven or eight to one, excluding persons legalized under the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986. California and New York, the top two refugee resettlement States, are also the top two States of destination for immigrants. Refugees are most likely to have a notable impact when States of small or medium size become a favored resettlement site for a particular refugee group, as in the case of Laotian Hmong refugees in Wisconsin.

Local Impact

The effects that refugees may have on the localities in which they resettle depend not only on numbers, employment, and culture but also on the characteristics of the receiving communities. Likewise the perception as to whether refugees are having positive or negative, limited or major effects on the localities is

conditioned by the perspectives of those affected. At the arrival levels that have prevailed in recent years, the growth of most refugee communities is slow compared with the overall size of those communities, and the impact of the new arrivals may not be discernible. ORR sponsored an examination of the issue of refugee impact in the early 1980's (Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement at the Local Level: The Role of the Ethnic Community and the Nature of Refugee Impact). This study focused on the period around 1980 when the flow of refugees from Southeast Asia was at its peak. However, its insights can be generalized to other refugee situations and, with care, to many other immigrant communities as well.

The analysis suggests a distinction between the actual effects that refugees have on the localities in which they settle and the public perceptions of their perceived impact. The study indicates that refugees do have important effects, some positive and some negative, some short term and some long term. These effects must be analyzed separately in areas such as education, housing, employment, and community services.

However, the public perception that refugees have a negative impact does not necessarily correspond to their actual effects. In analyzing refugee ethnic communities, the study notes both their role in providing very concrete and tangible support to refugees and perhaps their more important role in providing the kinds of intangible social, cultural, emotional, and even political support to their members that is virtually unavailable from other sources. The precise structure of these ethnic communities varies among the different ethnic groups, among the study's sites, and over time. The study concludes that economic development is also a key element in the general strength of the ethnic community.

Office of Community Services

Community Services Block Grant Program

Program Summary

CSBGs are awarded to States which, in turn, provide grants and contracts to a network of public and private community based organizations (including Community Action Agencies and migrant and seasonal farm-worker organizations) to provide services and undertake activities to ameliorate the causes and conditions of poverty in local communities. CSBG funds also are made available to Indian Tribes who apply directly to the Office of Community Services (OCS). In FY1994, \$397 million was appropriated to carry out the purposes of the CSBG program.

Recipients of CSBG funds are required to provide a range of services and activities to address the following needs: employment, education, making better use of available income, housing, nutrition, emergency services, and health. States and Indian Tribes have the flexibility to provide, consistent with the statute, such services and activities that they determine best meet the needs of low-income individuals and families.

Impact of Immigration on CSBG Program

Federal data regarding which immigrants can, and do, access CSBG programs are unavailable. There has been no statutory or regulatory requirement to collect such information either on the part of OCS or the States or tribes receiving CSBG funds. Because the CSBG budget is not calculated based on the number of individuals served, there is no impact directly attributable to immigrant or citizen use.

Discretionary Grants Program

Program Summary

In FY1994, the CSBG Discretionary Grants program provided \$50.6 million in assistance to programs of national and regional significance. Assistance is available on a competitive basis to the following entities: private, locally initiated community development corporations that sponsor enterprises providing employment, training, and business development opportunities for low-income residents; public and private nonprofit agencies that provide activities benefiting migrants and seasonal farmworkers; public and private organizations that carry out programs in rural housing and community facilities development; and private, nonprofit organizations that provide recreational activities for low-income youth.

Impact of Immigration on Discretionary Grants Program

Funding is provided for the development of projects to aid low-income individuals in general and does not focus on any particular needy population, such as immigrants or refugees. Eligible organizations representing such groups must compete with all other applicants for funding. Immigrants and refugees probably receive services from projects funded under the Discretionary Grants Program, particularly from projects directed toward serving migrants and seasonal farmworkers, but there are no data available indicating the number and location of such users. There are no restrictions on serving immigrants in projects funded under this program.

Community Food and Nutrition Program

Program Summary

The Community Food and Nutrition Program in FY1994 provided \$7.9 million in assistance to public and private agencies at the community-based, State, and national levels for the purposes of coordinating existing food assistance resources; assisting in identifying sponsors of child nutrition programs and initiating new programs in underserved and unserved areas; and developing innovative approaches at the State and local levels to meet the nutritional needs of low-income people. Funding for this program is provided on a competitive basis as well as distributed to States on a formula basis.

Impact of Immigration on Community Food and Nutrition Program

The impact of immigration on this program is similar to that of the Discretionary Grants Program. While there are no data available on the extent to which this program serves immigrants; it is reasonable to assume that immigrants who are served by this program benefit to the same extent as citizens who also are served.

Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)

Program Summary

LIHEAP helps low-income people meet their home energy costs. In FY1994, \$1.4 billion was appropriated for the regular program, and the availability of \$300 million in contingency funds was extended from the previous year. Recipients of funding in FY1994 were the States, the District of Columbia, Indian Tribes and tribal organizations, and U.S. territories.

Impact of Immigration on LIHEAP

There is no Federal information on the extent to which immigrants can, and do, access LIHEAP. The LIHEAP statute does not specify immigrants as a target group for assistance. Also, because the budget for LIHEAP is not determined by the number of persons who access its services, there is no effect on its budgetary total attributable to immigrant access.

Social Services Block Grant

Program Summary

SSBG (Title XX of the Social Security Act) is the major source of Federal funding for social services programs in the States. SSBG provides formula grants directly to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and eligible territories and commonwealths.

Under SSBG, Federal funds are available without a matching requirement. In FY1994, States received a total allotment of \$2.8 billion. Within the specific limitations in the law, each State has the flexibility to determine what services will be provided, who is eligible to receive services, and how funds are distributed among the various services offered. State and local Title XX agencies (that is, county, city and regional offices) may provide these services directly or purchase them from qualified agencies and individuals.

Also, in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, Congress amended Title XX of the Social Security Act to provide a one-time set-aside amount of grant funds totaling \$1 billion for localities designated as Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities (EZ/EC). EZ/EC SSBG funds are separate and distinct from the regular Title XX Social Services Block Grant in both the flexible program uses for the funds and the decision-making authority for determining those uses.

Specifically, Title XX was amended to permit a greatly expanded range of programmatic activities that can be financed with EZ/EC SSBG monies, as opposed to the more limited options for regular SSBG funds, including economic and community development and infrastructure projects. Furthermore, all decision-making authority for using EZ/EC SSBG funds to finance particular activities is vested in the local EZ/EC lead entity and community-based governance process, as opposed to the State under the regular Title XX Social Services Block Grant; in the EZ/EC program, the State primarily functions as a "pass-through" funding conduit for the EZ/EC SSBG award.

EZ/EC SSBG funds were provided to 6 urban and 3 rural Empowerment Zones and 95 Enterprise Communities to assist those localities in addressing their specific needs. Among the programs that the EZ/ECs identified as relevant to their communities are: programs to train and employ zone residents in the construction and rehabilitation of public infrastructure and affordable housing; after-school programs to keep schools open during the evenings and on weekends; and drug and alcohol prevention and treatment programs that provide comprehensive services for pregnant women, mothers, and their children.

Impact of Immigration on SSBG Programs

Each State must submit a preexpenditure report to the Secretary of HHS on the intended use of SSBG funds. The only requirement in the statute is that the report include information regarding the type of activities to be funded and the characteristics of the individuals to be served. While there is no specific information available in these reports on the social services provided to immigrants and refugees, a State has the flexibility to offer the same services under SSBG to these groups that are available to other residents of the State. With the enactment of PRWORA, States have the option to deny SSBG assistance to legal immigrants beginning January 1, 1997. Because the budgets for SSBG programs are not based on the number of individuals that use their services, immigrant use has no effect on the budget outlays.

Although many of the 104 EZ/EC localities receiving EZ/EC SSBG funds may include immigrant populations, the size and configuration of those designated areas prohibits a valid assessment of that population and the services they currently may be receiving. It is unclear if EZ/EC SSBG funds, with their unique characteristics distinct from regular SSBG monies, will be affected directly by PRWORA.

Head Start

Program Summary

Head Start is a national program that provides comprehensive educational, medical, health, nutritional, social, and other services to primarily low-income preschool children and their families. In FY1994, about 740,000 children received Head Start services. Up to 10 percent of Head Start's enrollment may be reserved for preschool children from families above the Federal poverty level (FPL). Also 10 percent of enrollment must be reserved for preschool children with disabilities (currently, about 13 percent of Head Start's national enrollment are children with disabilities). In addition, Head Start funds programs for Indian and migrant children. While these programs generally serve children from ages 3 or 4 to the age of compulsory school attendance, some are authorized to serve children from birth onward. In FY1994, there were 1,405 Head Start grantees and approximately 600 delegate agencies in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and eligible territories and commonwealths.

Impact of Immigration on the Head Start Program

There are no data on the number of immigrants being served by the Head Start program. As far as the budget is concerned, because Head Start's budget is not based on the number of children and families served, immigrant access to this program does not affect it.

Office of Family Assistance

Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC)

As indicated before, AFDC is being replaced by TANF with the enactment of PRWORA on August 22, 1996.

Program Summary

The AFDC program (Title IV-A of the Social Security Act) is a federally funded program administered by States and certain territories. In the AFDC program, States make assistance payments to needy families with dependent children deprived of parental support or care because of a parent's absence, death, incapacity, or the unemployment of a parent who is the principal earner.

To become eligible for AFDC payments, the individual must be a citizen or lawfully admitted for permanent residence or otherwise permanently residing in the United States under color of law. However, provisions included in IRCA disqualified newly legalized immigrants from participation in the AFDC program for a period of 5 years from the date of receipt of their legalized status; the only exceptions to this disqualification are Cuban and Haitian entrants.

A sponsored alien, not otherwise disqualified under IRCA, who applies for AFDC within 3 years of his or her entry into the United States will be evaluated by having the sponsor's income and resources deemed available to the alien according to a prescribed formula for a period not to exceed 3 years from the alien applicant's date of entry.

In FY1994, total State and Federal expenditures for the AFDC program were \$26.2 billion.

Impact of Immigration on AFDC

Table 7 shows the AFDC reciprocity rates for legal immigrants from 1990-1994, not including recipients of emergency assistance.¹ According to this table, the legal immigrant proportion of all AFDC recipients has remained relatively modest, between 4 and 6 percent of the total AFDC population. There has been an increase from 1990-1994, from 4.2 percent to 5.8 percent, with most of the increase occurring from 1992-1994 and attributable primarily to increased use by refugees and legal immigrants legalized under IRCA who began to be eligible for AFDC around 1992.

TABLE 7.—AFDC Reciprocity Rates for Legal Immigrants

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
# of Legal Immigrant (L.I.) Recipients	484,917	544,211	634,233	722,814	823,318
# of All AFDC Recipients	11,518,748	12,657,236	13,596,518	14,045,207	14,246,450
% of L.I. AFDC Recipients	4.2	4.3	4.7	5.1	5.8

¹ These figures are based on the AFDC Quality Control File, a sample of State administrative data that was used to study the trends in immigrant usage of AFDC. Quality Control data is drawn from monthly samples provided by each State and is used to determine errors in payments to recipients. Some potential problems with the AFDC Quality Control data include an insufficient number of sample immigrant cases in some States and problems relating to the proper coding of citizenship status in some States.

In addition, according to the aforementioned GAO report, most AFDC households that included legal immigrants also contained citizen recipients. Moreover, the report confirms that nearly one-third of immigrants receiving AFDC are refugees.

Emergency Assistance (EA)

Program Summary

EA is a State-administered optional program that provides temporary financial assistance and services to needy families with children to prevent destitution and provide shelter. The Federal Government shares 50 percent of the costs of these benefits with the States. If a State elects to operate an EA program, it must provide assistance to any family member, otherwise eligible for AFDC, including one who is a citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence or otherwise residing in the United States under color of law. States also have the option to provide EA to undocumented immigrants.

States have flexibility in defining what constitutes an emergency and the type and amount of assistance that they will provide. Assistance may be in the form of cash, services, or items a family needs, such as food, clothing, and furniture. Federal matching funds are available only for emergency assistance that the State authorizes during one 30-day period in any 12 consecutive months. Funds may be available to meet needs that arose before the 30-day period or that extend beyond the 30-day period.

In FY1994, total Federal/State expenditures for the EA program were approximately \$1.56 billion.

Impact of Immigration on EA Program

There is no Federal information available on the impact of immigration on the EA program.

Office of Child Support Enforcement

Program Summary

Established in 1975, the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) program is a joint Federal and State effort (Title IV-D of the Social Security Act). Its goals are to ensure that children are supported financially by their parents, to foster family responsibility, and to reduce welfare costs.

Impact of Immigration on CSE Program

Data on immigrants' use of CSE services are not available. CSE cases fall into four categories: AFDC, non-AFDC, Medicaid only, and foster care. There are no restrictions or limitations on use of services by immigrants. However, it is known that in FY1994, approximately 5.8 percent of AFDC recipients were non-U.S. citizens. It can be projected that the AFDC portion of the CSE caseload probably has a similar percentage of non-U.S. citizens.

Administration of Developmental Disabilities (ADD)

Program Summary

ADD administers the programs authorized under the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, as amended. The goal of these programs is to ensure that individuals with developmental disabilities and their families participate in the design of and access to, culturally competent services, supports, and other assistance and opportunities that promote independence, productivity, integration, and inclusion into the community. The ADD programs work in partnership with individuals with developmental disabilities and their families, State governments, local communities, and the private sector to address such issues as prevention, diagnosis, early intervention, therapy, education, training, employment, leisure opportunities, and community and institutional living.

Many services supported by ADD and provided by State and local communities are available to immigrants and refugees with disabilities and their families. The ADD program comprises the following four programs:

- State Developmental Disabilities Councils, which promote capacity building and advocacy, the development of a consumer- and family-centered comprehensive system, and a coordinated array of supports, and other assistance designed to help people with developmental disabilities.
- The Protection and Advocacy (P&A) program, which provides for the protection and advocacy of legal and human rights through formula grants to States.
- University Affiliated Programs (UAP), which provide interdisciplinary training, exemplary service, technical assistance, and information dissemination activities through a grant program.
- Projects of National Significance (PNS) are awards to innovative public or private nonprofit institutions that seek to enhance the independence, productivity, integration, and inclusion into the community of people with developmental disabilities. Monies also support the development of national and State policy.

Impact of Immigration on ADD

The impact of immigration on local ADD-supported programs is unknown and difficult to assess, because eligibility for ADD-related programs is not based on immigration status. However, it is reasonable to assume that some immigrants benefit from ADD programs and services. Because the budgets for ADD's programs are not calculated based on the number of individuals served, immigrant use has no effect on the total budget.

Public Health Service

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)

Agency Summary

SAMHSA (1992-1994) and its predecessor, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) (1988-1991), administers several programs that might be affected by immigration into the United States: the Refugee Mental Health Program; two SAMHSA-administered block grants established in 1992 and their ADAMHA-administered precursor; a program providing assistance to homeless individuals with serious mental illness; a program providing comprehensive community-based services for children with serious emotional disturbance; a program providing protection and advocacy for individuals with serious mental illness; a program that provides assistance to communities in developing resources to prevent substance abuse; and several demonstration programs. Descriptions of these programs are included in Appendix A, Additional Information on SAMHSA Programs.

Refugee Mental Health Program

Program Summary

From 1988-1991, ADAMHA supported between 110 and 150 beds at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, DC, which were allocated for mental health assessment and treatment of Cuban refugees and other persons from abroad. ADAMHA also had cooperative agreements that provided a range of 132 to 152 beds for community mental health care in halfway house settings. The Department of Justice provided funding ranging between \$12 million to \$14 million annually for this program. In October 1992, in conjunction with the reorganization of ADAMHA, the activities of the Refugee Mental Health Program were transferred to the Refugee Mental Health Branch, Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS), SAMHSA. In addition to the Cuban/Haitian activities, the Branch develops other consultative activities with Federal

agencies, in particular ORR. These activities are supported by ORR, through an interagency agreement that transferred funds to CMHS for support of these activities.²

Impact of Immigration on the Refugee Mental Health Program

Immigration policies that potentially affect mass migrations or repatriations (for example, from Cuba or Haiti) have a significant impact on the Refugee Mental Health Program's service delivery systems.

Block Grants

Program Summaries

The Community Mental Health Services block grant provides funds to the States and territories to enable them to carry out the States' plans for providing comprehensive community mental health services to adults with serious mental illness and to children with a serious emotional disturbance; evaluate programs and services carried out under the plan; and conduct planning, administration, and educational activities related to providing services under the plan.

The Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT) block grant provides funds directly to States to provide substance abuse prevention and treatment services based on State needs assessments and State plans.

Before the establishment of SAMHSA in 1992, ADAMHA administered the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services (ADMS) block grant, which provided financial assistance to States and territories to support programs and activities involving the prevention and treatment of alcohol and drug abuse; and to support community mental health centers for the provision of services for individuals with mental illness and children and adolescents with serious emotional disturbance.

Impact of Immigration on Block Grant Programs

Because the funding mechanisms for the SAMHSA and ADAMHA block grants are primarily based on population-driven formulas for determining State allotments, a significant increase in a State's population caused by immigration would require an increase in the State's allotment. Other States' allotments would decrease correspondingly. However, receipt of services from these programs has not been dependent on citizenship or immigrant status, and there is no information available regarding the immigrants' use of these services.

Assistance to Homeless Individuals With Mental Illness

Program Summary

SAMHSA (and from 1988-1991, ADAMHA) supports a program to assist homeless persons with severe mental illness, initially through the Mental Health Services to the Homeless (MHSH) block grant, and then through the Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH) formula grant program. Both the MHSH block grant and the PATH program have provided outreach and mental health treatment programs to homeless persons with serious mental illness and, under the PATH program, to those individuals at risk of homelessness.

² In September 1995, the Cuban/Haitian activities of the Refugee Mental Health Branch were transferred to the Department of Justice. At the same time, the consultative activities, funded by ORR, were transferred to the Special Programs Development Branch, CMHS, and SAMHSA. Since September 1995, Special Programs Development Branch staff, through an interagency agreement with ORR, provide consultation and technical assistance, to Federal, State, and local agencies, and ORR-funded programs, on refugee mental health. These activities include onsite and phone consultation on program development and implementation; development and dissemination of technical assistance documents; and development and provision of workshops and training to resettlement and mental health agency staff.

Impact of Immigration on Assistance to Homeless Individuals with Mental Illness Program
Eligibility for this program has not been dependent on citizenship or immigrant status. Therefore, no information is available regarding the immigrants' use of these services.

Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children and Their Families Program

Program Summary

The Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children and Their Families program was authorized in 1992 in the ADAMHA Reorganization Act to provide grants to States, political subdivisions, Native American reservations, and tribal organizations for provision of an array of community-based services organized into a system of care for children with serious emotional, behavioral, or mental disorders, and their families.

Impact of Immigration on Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children and Their Families Program

Eligibility for this program's services is not conditional based on immigrant status. There is no information available regarding the immigrants' use of these services.

Protection and Advocacy for Individuals With Mental Illness (PAIMI)

Program Summary

The PAIMI Act of 1986 authorizes formula grant allotments to be awarded to P&A systems that have been designated by the Governor in each State to protect the rights of and advocate for individuals with disabilities. The allotments are to be used to pursue administrative, legal, and other appropriate remedies to redress complaints of abuse, neglect, and rights violations and to protect and advocate the rights of individuals with mental illness through activities to ensure the enforcement of the Constitution and Federal and State statutes.

Impact of Immigration on PAIMI

Receipt of services from this program has not been dependent on citizenship or immigrant status, and information is not available regarding the immigrants' use of these services.

Demonstration Grant Programs

Program Summaries

The Community Partnership program, initiated in 1990, heralds a new approach for substance abuse prevention in the Nation. The program is predicated on the concept that empowered communities can marshal their resources to solve their own problems, such as substance abuse, violence, the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS), drunk driving, school failure, and delinquency. Community Partnership grants permit representatives from government, business, health, religion, academia, schools, criminal justice, and other individuals to join together to assess, design, and implement communitywide prevention efforts.

SAMHSA, and its predecessor ADAMHA, supports several additional demonstration programs designed to expand services and knowledge concerning effective delivery of substance abuse and mental health services in distinct settings and to distinct groups of individuals with addictive and mental disorders. These programs have included the Capacity Expansion, Target Cities, Critical Populations, Criminal Justice, Treatment Campus, HIV/AIDS Outreach, Women and Children, and National Capital Area Demonstration and the DC Initiatives programs funded by SAMHSA's Center for Substance Abuse Treatment; the High Risk Youth and Pregnant and Postpartum Women and Infants programs funded by SAMHSA's Center for Substance Abuse Prevention; and the Access to Community Care and Effective Services and Support and Community Support; and AIDS demonstration programs funded by SAMHSA's Center for Mental Health Services.

Impact of Immigration on Demonstration Programs

Eligibility for services from SAMHSA's demonstration programs are not conditional based on citizenship or immigrant status. Consequently, there is no information available regarding the immigrants' use of these services. However, because the programs' budgets are not determined by the number of persons accessing their services, immigrant access would not affect the total budget.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

Agency Summary

The mission of CDC is to prevent unnecessary illness and premature death. CDC strives to achieve national prevention objectives by accomplishing the following:

- Conducting surveillance, epidemiological investigation, and laboratory research.
- Serving as national and international reference laboratories.
- Providing assistance, including grants, to State and local health departments.
- Disseminating findings through partners in academic institutions, medical care settings, and business and labor groups.

Services funded by CDC and provided by State and local health departments are available to immigrants and refugees. For example, CDC's Preventive Health and Health Services block grant is designed to give States flexibility to fund priority prevention programs tailored to specific needs. This block grant funds a wide variety of preventive health services. CDC also funds State-level activities in immunization, tuberculosis control, sexually transmitted disease prevention and control, HIV/AIDS prevention and education, health education, and health promotion. In addition, CDC manages a national program for control of infectious diseases. Through the Refugee Health Assessment Program, CDC grant funds are used to supplement local, State, and other Federal resources for providing initial health screening for infectious disease and referral services to refugees.

Impact of Immigration on CDC Programs

The impact of immigration on local preventive health services supported by CDC grant funds is unknown and difficult to assess. Eligibility for CDC-supported services is not based on immigration status, and national data on the immigration status of recipients is not maintained. However, it is reasonable to assume that immigrants benefit from CDC services. Therefore, changes in immigration and program eligibility could affect the local operation of CDC programs substantially, particularly in communities with high concentrations of immigrants. These programs are not based on the number of individuals served; therefore, immigrant use has no effect on the budget totals.

Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)

Agency Summary

The programs administered by HRSA are designed to improve the health of the Nation by accomplishing the following:

- Ensuring that quality health care is available to underserved and vulnerable populations.
- Promoting primary care education and practice.

HRSA, in providing national leadership in health care and public health, works to ensure that health care is available, independent of cultural and linguistic factors or economic circumstances. The diversity of programs supported by HRSA reflects this philosophy and unity of purpose.

HRSA administers preventive and primary health care programs, which address the needs of disadvantaged and underserved populations. These programs include the following:

- Community and Migrant Health Centers.

- Maternal and Child Health Care services, including pediatric emergency medical services.
- Health services for the homeless and residents of public housing.
- Ryan White grants for the provision of HIV/AIDS services.

Program descriptions for these programs are in Appendix B, Additional Information on HRSA Programs.

Impact of Immigration on HRSA Programs

Because HRSA supports programs located in areas most accessible to underserved and disadvantaged populations, it can be assumed that these programs serve immigrants, particularly the Community and Migrant Health Centers. However, data that are collected on recipients do not identify which of the recipients are immigrants.

Approximately 600 Community and Migrant Health Centers across the United States provide primary health care for more than 6 million persons with a culturally sensitive, family-oriented focus. Appropriated funds for the community health centers in FY1994 was \$603.7 million; for the migrant health centers the amount was \$59.0 million. Among services that may specifically benefit immigrants are the provision of the following:

- Medical documents that may serve as proof of residence in the United States.
- Physician examinations in connection with immigration and refugee processes requiring follow-up care when medical problems have been identified.

Because the budgets for HRSA programs are not based on the number of persons served, immigrant access to these programs has no effect on the total budget.

Administration On Aging (AoA)

Agency Summary

There are 44 million people in America age 60 or older. Some of these older individuals are at risk of losing their independence, including 4 million people over age 85, those living alone without a caregiver, members of minority groups, older persons with physical or mental impairments, low-income older persons, and those who are abused, neglected, or exploited.

AoA was established by the Older Americans Act of 1965 to meet the diverse needs of the growing number of older people. AoA is the Federal focal point and advocacy agency for older persons. It works closely with its nationwide network of regional offices, State units on aging, area agencies on aging, and tribal organizations to plan, coordinate, and develop community-level systems of services designed to meet the unique needs of older persons and their caregivers. It funds supportive in-home and community services, including access services (for example, information and referral, transportation, and case management), in-home services (for example, home repair, home-delivered meals, personal care, homemaker-home health aide), community services (for example, senior centers, congregate meals, day care, nursing home ombudsmen, health promotion, etc.), and care-giver services (for example, respite, counseling, and education).

Impact of Immigration on the AoA

The affect of immigration on local AoA supported programs is unknown and difficult to assess because eligibility for AoA-related programs is not based on immigration status. However, it is reasonable to assume that immigrants benefit from AoA programs and services. Therefore, changes in immigration and program eligibility could impact AoA programs substantially, particularly in communities with high concentrations of older immigrants. As for the budget, immigrant use of AoA programs would not affect the total budget because it is not calculated based on the number of persons accessing those programs.

Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA)

Medicaid

Program Summary

The Medicaid program is a Federal- and State-financed entitlement program that purchases medical assistance for certain low-income families and persons who are aged, blind, or have disability. In FY1994, 35.1 million individuals were enrolled in the program, and Medicaid benefits (Federal portion) totaled \$78.8 billion.

Table 8 shows the following categories of recipients that make up the 35.1 million Medicaid enrollees in FY1994.

TABLE 8.—Medicaid Enrollees, FY1994

	# (millions)	%
Total	35.1	100.0
Aged	4.0	11.4
Blind/Disabled	5.6	16.0
AFDC-Children	16.9	48.1
AFDC-Adults	7.7	21.9
Other	0.8	2.3

Impact of Immigration on the Medicaid Program

Generally, Title XIX of the Social Security Act permits full Medicaid eligibility to the following groups of immigrants: lawful permanent residents and persons permanently residing in the United States under color of law. Immigrants not listed above include: immigrants lawfully admitted for a temporary period, such as students and visitors; persons who entered the country legally whose visas have expired; and persons who have entered the country illegally, who have not been apprehended by the INS and have no immigration status of any kind. These undocumented immigrants are eligible for emergency services only under Medicaid, if all other requirements for Medicaid eligibility are met. Emergency services include any emergency medical condition that puts the immigrants' health in serious jeopardy (including labor and delivery).

Because HCFA does not require States to submit data on the percentage of alien Medicaid recipients and States have not voluntarily reported such information, it is difficult to determine how many of these are legal or illegal immigrants. However, it is assumed that under the AFDC-based eligibility categories, participation by immigrants may have been similar to the 5.8 percent welfare reciprocity rate in 1994 (disclosed earlier in this report).

Medicare

Program Summary

The Medicare program is a Federal health insurance program for most people age 65 or older and certain people with disabilities. The Medicare program has two parts; Hospital Insurance (Part A) and Supplemental Medical Insurance (Part B). Generally, most people age 65 and older have access to Medicare Part A benefits, based on their own or their spouse's employment, without having to pay a premium. Medicare Part A is "premium-free" for individuals who meet the age requirement and for whom any of the following three statements is true:

- They receive benefits under the Social Security or Railroad Retirement system.

- They could receive benefits under the Social Security or Railroad Retirement system but have not filed for them.
- The individual or their spouse had Medicare-covered government employment.

Individuals under 65 years of age also can get premium-free Medicare Part A benefits if they have been a disabled beneficiary under Social Security or the Railroad Retirement Board for more than 24 months. For example, an individual who receives Social Security disability insurance (SSDI) benefits for more than 24 months automatically becomes eligible for Medicare. To the extent that welfare reform changes the SSI eligibility criteria for immigrants, such changes consequently will affect disabled immigrant access to Medicare.

Part B benefits are available to almost all resident citizens 65 years of age or over; to certain aliens 65 years of age or over (even those who are not entitled to Part A); and to disabled beneficiaries entitled to Medicare Part A. Most Medicare Part B enrollees are eligible for Part B because they are eligible for premium-free Medicare Part A benefits based on the work described previously. All Medicare Part B enrollees pay premiums; presently this amount is 25 percent of the cost of the Medicare benefit.

Table 9 shows the number of individuals enrolled in Medicare on July 1, 1994, and Benefit Payments made during FY1994.

TABLE 9.—Medicare Enrollees (Millions) and Benefit Payments (\$ in Billions)

	Medicare Enrollees, July 1, 1994	Benefit Payments, FY1994
Hospital Insurance (Part A)	36.5	\$101.3
Aged	32.4	89.6
Disabled	4.1	11.7
Supplemental Medical Insurance (Part B)	35.2*	58.0
Aged	31.4	50.2
Disabled	3.7	7.8

*Numbers do not sum to total because of rounding.

Impact of Immigration on the Medicare Program

Legal immigrants and citizens who are not otherwise eligible may opt to buy in to the Medicare program if they meet certain eligibility criteria. They must be over age 65 and must meet a 5-year U.S. residency requirement before becoming eligible to purchase Medicare Part B. While eligibility for Part A benefits is not explicitly conditioned on such a requirement, purchasers of Part A must be eligible for Part B, effectively requiring all individuals who exercise this option to meet the 5-year residency requirement for both Parts A and B.

The Medicare buy-in option is one way immigrants may enroll in Medicare. While data on the number of immigrants who have used this option are not available, there is general information on the number of individuals who have bought into Medicare and the proportion of that group to the total Medicare population. In 1994, less than 1 percent of all Medicare Part A enrollees (approximately 334,000 persons) paid a premium for this coverage. While this percentage is small, it still represents twice as many people who paid premiums in 1990 (approximately 166,000 individuals).

Other than this residency requirement, Medicare does not have any special eligibility requirements for noncitizens or nonresidents. Any individual, meeting the residency requirement, may enroll in Medicare if he or she meets the enrollment requirements related primarily to age and contributions or may purchase it if contributions are not sufficient. In addition, because immigrants are younger than the general population and generally attached to the workforce, new immigrants represent a positive contribution to the Medicare Trust Funds and help support the system.

Social Security Administration

Social Security Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSDI)

Program Summary

The RSDI program is designed to partially replace the income that is lost by a worker and/or his or her family when the worker retires in old age, becomes severely disabled before retirement age, or dies. About 97 percent of the jobs in paid employment and all self-employment are covered under Social Security.

The RSDI program generally treats aliens the same as U.S. citizens. There are two exceptions, as follows:

- Under the alien nonpayment provision, a beneficiary who is not a citizen or national of the United States and has been outside the United States for 6 consecutive calendar months may not be paid benefits beginning with the seventh month of absence. Benefits resume when the beneficiary returns to the United States and remains for 1 full calendar month. Certain exceptions in the law to this general rule allow many aliens to receive their benefits outside the United States without interruption. These exceptions are based, for the most part, on the citizenship of the individual.
- Entitled aliens who are deported for certain reasons under INA may not be paid benefits. Benefits may again be payable if the deported alien is subsequently admitted for permanent residence by the INS.

TABLE 10.—Aliens not Paid RSDI Benefits Under Nonpayment Provisions,
By Selected Month

Month	Nonpayment After 6-Month Absence	Nonpayment Due to Deportation
December 1989	10,157	635
December 1990	11,006	778
March 1991	11,570	776
March 1992	13,103	762
March 1995	16,689	951

Note: Figures are not available for 1993 or 1994.

Some aliens enter the United States illegally. Others enter legally but lose their status because they remain in the United States beyond the period of their authorized stay. Many of these aliens work in the United States long enough to become insured for RSDI benefits.

For claims filed before December 1, 1996, individuals in the United States meeting RSDI eligibility requirements are paid benefits without regard to citizenship or alien status. However, effective with applications filed December 1, 1996, or later, an alien must be lawfully present in the United States, as defined by the Attorney General, to receive RSDI benefits in the United States.

Impact of Immigration on RSDI Program

No Federal information on the impact of immigration is available.

Enumeration Process (Issuing Social Security Numbers)

The nine-digit Social Security number (SSN) was originally intended only to keep track of the earnings of people who worked in jobs covered under the Social Security program. By the early 1970's the use of the number expanded as the government and private sector increasingly used it as a multipurpose identifier. Because of the fraud and widespread use of the SSN and the SSN card, Congress enacted legislation requiring all applicants for SSNs to provide evidence to establish age, identity, and citizenship or alien status.

An individual, whether citizen or alien, needs an SSN to obtain a job, pay taxes, or receive benefits under many government benefit programs. SSA issues SSN cards to those aliens admitted for permanent residence and those admitted on a temporary basis, with or without work authority.

Aliens, like all applicants, must meet certain requirements to obtain SSNs. In addition to providing evidence of age, identity, and alien status, applicants age 18 and older applying for original SSN cards must appear for a personal interview. Lawful aliens who want SSN cards for work purposes must prove they are authorized to work, usually by showing their INS documents. SSA issues unrestricted SSN cards to permanent resident aliens and refugees. In September 1992, SSA began issuing SSN cards with the legend "VALID FOR WORK ONLY WITH INS AUTHORIZATION" to aliens lawfully admitted to the United States with temporary work authorization. SSA issues SSN cards with the legend "NOT VALID FOR EMPLOYMENT" to lawful aliens not authorized to work who need an SSN for nonwork purposes (for example, to obtain a driver's license in a State that requires an SSN for that purpose). In February 1996, SSA began defining a valid nonwork reason as a Federal, State, or local statute or regulation that requires the individual to provide an SSN to obtain the benefit or service. SSA issues SSN cards to illegal aliens only when they will be paid benefits under a program financed in whole or in part from Federal funds. They receive cards annotated "NOT VALID FOR EMPLOYMENT."

Impact of Immigration on SSN Issuance

In FY1995, SSA issued about 6 million original SSN cards and about 11.2 million replacement SSN cards. Of the original cards issued, about 1.5 million (about 25 percent) were to aliens (about 63 percent of whom were allowed to work). Of the replacement cards, about 795,000 (about 7 percent) were issued to aliens (about 93 percent of whom were allowed to work).

In FY1994, SSA issued about 6 million original SSN cards and about 10.4 million replacement SSN cards. Of the original cards issued, about 1.4 million (23 percent) were to aliens (about 62 percent of whom were allowed to work). Of the replacement cards, about 790,000 (8 percent) were to aliens (about 93 percent of whom were allowed to work).

In FY1993, SSA issued about 6.2 million original SSN cards and about 10.7 million replacement SSN cards. Of the original cards issued, about 1.5 million (24 percent) were to aliens (about 73 percent of whom were allowed to work). Of the replacement cards, about 800,000 (7 percent) were to aliens (about 92 percent of whom were allowed to work).

In FY1992, SSA issued about 7 million original SSN cards and about 10.7 million replacement SSN cards. Of the original cards issued, about 1.6 million (23 percent) were to aliens (about 74 percent of whom were allowed to work). Of the replacement cards, about 765,000 (7 percent) were issued to aliens (about 91 percent of whom were allowed to work).

In FY1991, SSA issued about 7.5 million original SSN cards and about 10.5 million replacement cards. Of the original SSN cards issued, about 1.7 million cards (23 percent) were issued to aliens (about 75 percent of

whom were allowed to work). Of the replacement cards, about 730,000 (7 percent) were issued to aliens (about 88 percent of whom were allowed to work).

The totals for FY1992 through 1995 are shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11.—Original and Replacement SSN Cards Issued: FYs1992-1995

Year	Total Issued	Total Issued to Aliens	% of Total Cards Issued Which Were Issued to Aliens	% of Cards Issued to Aliens Who Were Work Authorized
Original SSN Cards				
1992	7 million	1.6 million	23	74
1993	6.2 million	1.5 million	24	73
1994	6 million	1.4 million	23	62
1995	6 million	1.5 million	25	63
Replacement SSN Cards				
1992	10.7 million	.765 million	7	91
1993	10.7 million	.800 million	7	92
1994	10.4 million	.790 million	8	93
1995	11.2 million	.795 million	7	91

Supplemental Security Income

Program Summary

The SSI program provides cash assistance directly to aged, blind, and disabled persons to help bring their incomes up to a federally established minimum level. SSA administers SSI payments nationwide. Eligibility has been limited to individuals (and their eligible spouses) who are age 65 and over, blind, or disabled; are U.S. citizens or certain aliens; and whose countable income and resources fall below federally established levels.

SSI operates as a program of last resort. Applicants are required to apply for all other benefits for which they may be eligible before evaluation for SSI eligibility. The SSI program then provides monthly payments to make up any difference between countable income and the minimum income floor established by statute. The minimum income in calendar year 1994 was \$446 a month for individuals and \$669 a month for individuals with an eligible spouse. In all but 12 States, SSI recipients are automatically eligible for Medicaid. In 12 States with more restrictive rules, Medicaid eligibility is determined by the State.

Eligibility of Various Categories of Aliens in the SSI Program

Prior to August 22, 1996, to be eligible for SSI benefits, an individual had to be a U.S. citizen or national, an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien who was a permanent resident under color of law (PRUCOL).

Legislation enacted on August 22, 1996 (and subsequently amended), eliminated the PRUCOL category. Under current law, to be SSI-eligible an alien must be in a "qualified" status and meet one of the exceptions to the general bar on eligibility that applies to qualified aliens.

Qualified aliens include: Lawfully admitted permanent residents (LAPRs); refugees admitted to the United States pursuant to Section 207 of the INA; asylees pursuant to Section 208; parolees under Section 212(d)(5) for a period of at least 1 year; an alien whose deportation has been withheld under Section 243(h) as in effect prior to April 1, 1997, or whose removal has been withheld under Section 241(b)(3); an alien granted conditional entry pursuant to Section 203(a)(7) as in effect prior to April 1, 1980; certain Cuban and Haitian entrants; and certain aliens who have been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty or whose children or parents have been so treated.

Exceptions that permit qualified aliens to receive SSI include (but are not limited to): LAPRs who can be credited with 40 qualifying quarters of work, qualified aliens with U.S. military active duty or veteran status, and qualified aliens who were lawfully residing in the United States on August 22, 1996, and are blind or disabled.

Program Size

Table 12 shows the appropriated Federal funds for FYs 1988-1994; the total number of recipients (citizens and aliens) of SSI program benefits in December of each year, and, in addition to Federal funds, State supplementation paid to SSI recipients.

TABLE 12.—Size of Total SSI Program, 1988-1994

Month	Persons Served (millions)		
December 1988	4.5		
December 1989	4.7		
December 1990	4.9		
December 1991	5.2		
December 1992	5.6		
December 1993	6.1		
December 1994	6.4		
Fiscal Year	Appropriated Funds (billions)	Other Resources Available to Program (billions)	
		Federally Administered	State Administered
1988	\$12,300,384	\$2.7	\$0.4
1989	\$12,473,953	\$3.0	\$0.4
1990	\$12,034,758	\$3.2	\$0.5
1991	\$17,391,170	\$3.2	\$0.5
1992	\$17,479,491	\$3.4	\$0.6
1993	\$21,237,675	\$3.3	\$0.6
1994	\$27,322,866	\$3.1	\$0.6

Note: Program data cover all U.S. citizens and aliens.

Number of Aliens in SSI Population

The number of aliens in the SSI population in December of each year from FYs 1988-1994 is shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13.—Aliens in the SSI Population, 1988-1994

Month	Aliens Receiving SSI Benefits
December 1988	320,300
December 1989	370,300
December 1990	435,600
December 1991	519,660
December 1992	601,455
December 1993	683,178
December 1994	738,140

Impact of Immigration on SSI Program

Aliens made up 12 percent of the SSI recipients in December 1994.

Alien Participation in the Food Stamp Program

Introduction

The USDA, through FCS, administers the following 13 domestic food assistance programs:

- FSP
- Special Milk Program
- Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)
- National School Lunch Program (NSLP)
- Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico
- Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations
- Nutrition Assistance Program in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands
- School Breakfast Program (SBP)
- Commodity Supplemental Food Program
- The Emergency Food Assistance Program
- Farmers Market Nutrition Program
- Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
- Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)

Four programs (FSP, the Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico, the Nutrition Assistance Program in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and the Food Distribution on Indian Reservations) help meet the basic needs of low-income families and individuals. The remaining programs provide supplemental benefits to groups with special needs, especially those at different developmental stages: infants, children, child-bearing women, and the elderly.

FSP is the cornerstone of domestic food assistance, accounting for more than 2 out of every \$3 spent in FY1995, which is the most recent year of complete data. It provides a monthly benefit to anyone with low income and few assets in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. The Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico, the Nutrition Assistance Program in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands, and the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations serve a similar function in Puerto Rico and on Indian reservations and the trust territories, respectively. In FY1995, food stamp recipients received \$22.8 billion in benefits. In an average month, 26.6 million people received food stamps.

NSLP serves children in schools and residential institutions. It is available to 98 percent of public school children and more than 90 percent of all school children. SBP serves the same group but is not as widely available. It is most frequently found in schools serving high proportions of lower-income students. The Special Milk Program primarily serves children in schools not participating in other child-nutrition programs. CACFP serves children and functionally impaired or elderly adults cared for in daycare centers, family daycare homes, and adult daycare programs. SFSP provides meals to school children in needy areas throughout summer vacation.

WIC serves low-income infants, children and child-bearing women who are found to be at nutritional risk. WIC provides nutritious supplementary food, nutrition education, and referrals to health care services. The Commodity Supplemental Food Program serves essentially the same group and, in addition, provides benefits to the elderly in certain areas.

The Emergency Food Assistance Program provides commodities for home consumption through food banks and other charitable institutions. Commodities for Charitable Institutions provides commodities to soup kitchens and similar organizations to support meal service to needy recipients. The Nutrition Program for the Elderly supplements other programs for the elderly with cash and commodities for meals in senior citizen centers and similar settings.

Four programs (FSP, WIC, NSLP, and the Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico) paid out more than \$34 billion in benefits to program participants in FY1995, 91 percent of all food assistance benefits. FSP alone provided \$22.8 billion in benefits to participants, nearly 68 percent of all food assistance benefits in FY1995.

Among the domestic food assistance programs administered by the USDA, FSP is by far the largest and is the only program with explicit Federal statutory restrictions on the eligibility and participation of aliens. Consequently, this discussion focuses exclusively on the extent of participation by aliens in FSP.

What follows is a brief description of FSP, eligible alien categories, a system for verifying eligible alien status, the most recent data available on alien participation in FSP, and current studies on the effect of IRCA on FSP.

The Food Stamp Program

Program Description

FSP is a nationwide program that helps low-income families and individuals buy the food they need to maintain a nutritious diet. In an average month in FY1995, about 26.6 million people received food stamp benefits at an annual cost of \$22.8 billion.

The Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, defines the group of people who constitute a household for food stamp purposes and sets uniform criteria for their eligibility. These include a gross and net income limit, a resource limit, and a variety of nonfinancial criteria.

To be eligible for food stamps, the gross monthly income of most households must be at or below 130 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines (\$20,280 annually for a family of four effective October 1, 1996) and net income—after allowable deductions—must be at or below 100 percent of the guidelines. Households with an elderly or disabled member are subject only to the net income restriction. Gross income includes all cash payments to the household with a few exceptions, including nonrecurring lump sum payments and reimbursement of certain expenses. Deductions subtracted from the household's gross monthly income to determine its net income include: a standard deduction, an earned income deduction, a dependent care deduction, an excess shelter expense deduction, a special medical deduction (for elderly or disabled persons), and a child support deduction for court-ordered payments to another household.

The value of a household's assets is also accounted for in determining program eligibility. Most households are permitted up to \$2,000 in countable resources. Households with at least one person age 60 years or older are allowed up to \$3,000.

People can qualify for benefits only as part of a "food stamp household." In general, a food stamp household consists of an individual who lives alone or who lives with others but usually purchases and prepares food separately; and groups of individuals who live, purchase food, and prepare meals together.

FSP includes several provisions to encourage able-bodied participants to seek and hold jobs. With certain exceptions, physically and mentally fit food stamp participants must apply for and accept suitable employment.

The maximum amount of food stamps a household can receive is set according to 100 percent of the June cost of the Thrifty Food Plan (TFP) for a reference family of four, adjusted for household size. (TFP is the least-costly food plan developed by the Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion at USDA, which suggests the amounts of food that could be consumed by males and females of different ages to meet dietary standards). The maximum allotments are revised periodically to reflect changes in the cost of foods included in the TFP. The food stamp benefit issued to each household is based on the number of people in the household and the amount of net income available after subtracting the allowable deductions. Monthly benefits are equal to the maximum allotment for that household less 30 percent of its net income.

Eligibility of Aliens in the Food Stamp Program

Under current regulations, an individual applying for food stamps who is not a citizen of the United States must provide acceptable documentation that verifies that he or she is an eligible alien (the exception is for those applying for disaster assistance benefits).

Before the enactment of PRWORA, the following groups of aliens were considered "eligible aliens":

- Those admitted for permanent residence as an immigrant as defined by INA.
- Those who qualify for conditional entry or are granted asylum under INA.
- Those who are lawfully present in the United States as a result of a grant of parole or an exercise of discretion by the Attorney General for emergency reasons.
- Those for whom the Attorney General has withheld deportation.
- Those who resided continuously in the United States since before January 1, 1972, and are otherwise eligible for lawful permanent resident status (Section 249 of INA) (effective November 6, 1986).
- Those granted lawful permanent residence as a result of the legalization program and are aged, blind, or disabled (Section 245A(b)(1) of INA and 1614 (a) (I) of the Social Security Act) (effective November 7, 1988).
- Those granted lawful residence (temporary or permanent) as a special agricultural worker (Section 210(a) of INA) (effective June 1, 1987).
- Those who will be granted lawful residence (temporary or permanent) as an additional special agricultural worker in FYs 1990-1993 (Section 210A(d)) (effective October 1, 1989).
- Those granted temporary resident status who subsequently gained permanent resident status but were prohibited from participating in FSP for 5 years from the date they originally gained temporary status (Sections 245A(a), 245A(b) (I) and 245A(h) (iii)) (applicants could apply for temporary status beginning May 5, 1987, and become eligible to participate in FSP beginning May 6, 1992).

PRWORA dramatically altered the eligibility of aliens for Federal means-tested programs, including FSP. Aliens legally in the United States became ineligible for food stamps unless they belonged to one of the following groups:

- Refugees, asylees, or have had their deportation withheld and were admitted within the last 5 years.
- Active-duty military personnel, honorably discharged veterans, and their spouses and dependent children.
- Those with 40 or more quarters of earnings and no public assistance receipt.

PRWORA provided that those aliens receiving benefits as of August 22, 1996, were allowed to continue receiving benefits until the first of either their recertification date or August 22, 1997. For new applicants, the alien restrictions generally became effective upon enactment of PRWORA. Section 510 of P.L. 104-208, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 1997, allowed aliens currently receiving benefits to continue on the caseload until the first recertification after April 1, 1997, or until August 22, 1997.

Alien Verification in the Food Stamp Program

IRCA established the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) program, a two-level verification system developed and maintained by the INS. Between October 1, 1988, and August 22, 1996, agencies administering FSP were required to validate the documentation of an alien applicant's status by accessing the INS database or by submitting manual verification requests to the INS. However, PRWORA made the use of SAVE optional.

Alien Participation in the Food Stamp Program

The most recent data available on the extent of participation by lawful aliens in FSP are based on data from the food stamp quality control system. The quality control system is an ongoing review of a sample of food stamp households to determine if they are eligible to participate and receive the correct benefit. FCS uses this sample—consisting of approximately 51,000 participating households during the year—to provide detailed information on the characteristics of participants, including alien status. Aliens are defined as all recipients who are not U.S. citizens; however, because undocumented aliens are not permitted to receive food stamps, almost all aliens are legal permanent residents, refugees, those granted asylum, or individuals who have been granted a stay of deportation.

As shown in Table 14, aliens make up a relatively small proportion of the total food stamp caseload and receive a small fraction of the total benefits. In FY1994, the most recent year for which information on the citizenship status of participants is available, 1.9 million aliens living in 1.1 million households received food stamps. Noncitizens represented 6.7 percent of all food stamp recipients. They received 6.5 percent of all food stamp benefits in that year. The overwhelming majority of alien recipients were legalized permanent residents; other aliens represented less than 25 percent of the alien caseload and only 1.5 percent of all food stamp recipients.

In the general population, resident aliens predominately live in a small number of States (California, Texas, New York, and Florida). Consistent with this pattern, the quality control sample data suggest that alien participation in FSP is highly localized. In 1994, 611,000 alien recipients lived in California, 307,000 lived in Texas, 302,000 lived in New York, and 157,000 lived in Florida. These four States accounted for nearly 75 percent of all aliens receiving food stamps. However, because the sample size used to estimate alien participation is relatively small, these estimates should be interpreted with care.

TABLE 14.—Citizenship Status of Food Stamp Recipients: FYs1991-1994

Citizenship Type	1991	1992	1993	1994
Native-born citizen	21,654,000	24,296,000	23,512,000	25,882,000
Naturalized citizen	170,000	187,000	193,000	248,000
Permanent resident	824,000	972,000	1,184,000	1,453,000
Refugee	285,000	288,000	343,000	385,000
Other alien	56,000	31,000	41,000	52,000
Alien subtotal	1,164,000	1,292,000	1,567,000	1,880,000
Foreign-born subtotal	1,334,000	1,479,000	1,760,000	2,127,000
All participants	22,988,000	25,775,000	25,752,000	28,009,000

Note: The following notes apply to the above table:

Figures are based on the Integrated Quality Control System (IQCS) full-year data for FYs1991-1994. Because the IQCS data are based on a sample and are weighted by household size, the total number of participants is slightly higher than the actual number of participants.

Because of rounding, numbers may not sum exactly to their totals.

Permanent residents include those coded as having obtained legal status through the IRCA's amnesty provisions.

Refugees include those granted asylum.

Other aliens include aliens granted a stay of deportation, nonimmigrants admitted for a specified period, Mexican citizens with "border" cards, undocumented aliens, and noncitizens whose exact status is unknown.

FCS Studies on the Effect of Immigration Reform on the Food Stamp Program

FCS estimates that IRCA's impact on food stamp participation is modest. More than 1.5 million persons received legal permanent residence under IRCA. The majority of these aliens were barred from receiving many public assistance benefits, including food stamps, for 5 years after applying for legalization. The vast majority of this group applied for legalization between May 5, 1987, and May 4, 1988; thus, the 5-year waiting period ended between May 1992 and May 1993. FCS undertook two studies on this population to examine the economic circumstances of this population and to assess how quickly they applied for food stamps after the 5-year waiting period expanded.

FCS partially funded the *Second Legalized Persons Survey (LPS2)*, which was a follow-up survey of persons granted permanent residency under IRCA who had participated in a 1989 survey. Between April and August 1992, more than 4,000 legalized aliens were interviewed for the follow-up survey, which included questions on family composition, income sources, and asset holdings. The survey data were used to describe the income and financial situations of this immigration group and to estimate the proportion of persons legalized under IRCA who meet the income and asset eligibility guidelines for food stamps. The data became available to the public in February 1996.

A second study funded by FCS, *The Effects of the Immigration Reform and Control Act on the Food Stamp Program*, examined data from LPS2 to estimate the proportion of newly legalized immigrants who qualified for food stamps and also examined State caseload data to estimate the number who receiving food stamps in 1994 and the value of those benefits received. The study results were released in September 1995.

The study found that in 1994 more than a quarter of newly legalized aliens (about 396,000) were eligible for food stamps based on their income and assets, and of these, 190,000 received food stamps. They represented less than 1 percent of the food stamp caseload. They received an estimated \$135 million in benefits in FY1994, representing 0.6 percent of all benefits.

Those eligible for food stamps participated at the same rate as the overall Hispanic population. They were twice as likely to live in households with earnings as other food stamp recipients and about as likely to receive AFDC benefits. They tended to live in large households, often containing U.S.-born children.

Appendix A:

Additional Information on SAMHSA³ Programs

Refugee Mental Health Program

In addition to SAMHSA's authorization, refugee-related activities are authorized under Section 501(c) of the Refugee Educational Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law No. 96-422). The program mandate is (1) to serve as a focal point for Cuban/Haitian entrant and refugee mental health issues, including liaison with other federal agencies, and (2) to develop, implement, and oversee mental health inpatient and outpatient programs to provide mental health treatment and to enable independent living in the United States.

This program was established in response to the arrival of nearly 125,000 Cubans on the South Florida shores from the Cuban Port of Mariel in 1980. Many of the Cubans had preexisting psychiatric problems. An inpatient mental health treatment facility was established at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, DC, in October 1980 by the INS and PHS. It has been continuously operated since that time. Once stabilized, patients are generally discharged to community-based halfway house programs. The community-based halfway house program was developed to facilitate the community adjustment of Mariel Cuban entrants who were mentally and/or developmentally disabled and who also often had criminal and/or antisocial histories and substance abuse problems. In addition, the program has been involved in interagency consultation and technical assistance with the Department of Justice's Community Relations Service and Bureau of Prisons.

Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT) Block Grant

The SAPT block grant provides financial assistance to States and territories to support projects for the development and implementation of prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation activities directed to the diseases of alcohol and drug abuse. Funds may be used at the discretion of the States to achieve the statutory objectives, including the fulfillment of certain requirements. Not less than 20 percent of the funds shall be spent for programs for individuals who do not require treatment for substance abuse but to educate and counsel such individuals and to provide for activities to reduce the risk of abuse by developing community-based strategies for prevention of such abuse, including the use of alcoholic beverages and tobacco products by individuals to whom it is unlawful to sell or distribute such beverages or products. In FY1993, States were required to expend not less than 5 percent of the grant to increase (relative to FY1992) the availability of treatment services designed for pregnant women and women with dependent children (either by establishing new programs or expanding the capacity of existing programs). A similar requirement existed for FY1994 relative to FY1993 levels. States must require programs of treatment for intravenous drug abuse to admit individuals into treatment within 14 days after they make such a request, or 120 days of a request, if interim services are made available within 48 hours. States provide, directly or through arrangements with other public or nonprofit entities, tuberculosis services such as counseling, testing, treatment, and early intervention services for substance abusers at risk for the HIV disease. Other statutory requirements also apply.

Community Mental Health Services Block Grant

The Community Mental Health Services block grant provides financial assistance to States and territories to enable them to carry out the State's plan for providing comprehensive community mental health services to adults with a serious mental illness and to children with a serious emotional disturbance; to evaluate

³ The ADAMHA Reorganization Act of 1992, Public Law 102-321 (July 10, 1992), created SAMHSA. The research components of ADAMHA were transferred to the National Institutes of Health, and its services components (the Centers for Substance Abuse Prevention and Substance Abuse Treatment and the new Center for Mental Health Services), with the Office of the Administrator, became the new SAMHSA.

programs and services carried out under the plan; and to conduct planning, administrative, and educational activities related to providing services under the plan.

Funds may be used at the discretion of the State to achieve the described objectives except for certain requirements and prescribed criteria. Services under the plan can be provided only through appropriate, qualified community programs (which may include community mental health centers, child mental health programs, psychosocial rehabilitation programs, mental health peer-support programs, and mental health primary consumer-directed programs). Services under the plan will be provided through community mental health centers only if the centers meet prescribed criteria. For FY1994, the State must expend not less than 10 percent of the grant to increase (relative to FY1993) funding for such centers and for any subsequent fiscal year, the State must expend for such centers not less than an amount equal to the amount expended by the State for FY1994. Up to 5 percent of grant funds may be used for administering the funds. In general, any amount paid to a State under the program shall be available for obligation until the end of the fiscal year for which the amounts were paid and if obligated by the end of such year, shall remain available for expenditure until the end of the succeeding fiscal year. Funds may not be used to provide inpatient services; to make cash payments to intended recipients of health services; to purchase or improve land; to purchase, construct, or permanently improve (other than minor remodeling) any building or other facility, or purchase major medical equipment; to satisfy any requirement for the expenditure of non-Federal funds as a condition for the receipt of Federal funds; or to provide financial assistance to any entity other than a public or nonprofit private entity.

Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services (ADMS) Block Grants

The objectives of the ADMS block grant, which was replaced by the SAPT block grant and Community Mental Health Services block grant with the creation of SAMHSA in 1992, is to provide financial assistance to States and territories to support projects for the development of more effective prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and activities to deal with alcohol and drug abuse; and to support community mental health centers for the provision of services for chronically mentally ill individuals, severely mentally disturbed children and adolescents, mentally ill elderly individuals, and for coordination of mental health and health care services provided within health care centers. Each State allotment under the ADMS block grant is available for obligation during the fiscal year it is allotted, and all such obligations must be expended by the end of the subsequent fiscal year. Funds are used at the discretion of each State to achieve the described objectives except for certain requirements. Ninety percent of the total State allotment must be used for mental health and substance abuse services in accordance with an intra-State distribution formula. Not less than 10 percent of the total allotment must be used for alcohol and drug abuse programs and services for women (especially pregnant women and women with dependent children) and demonstration projects for the provision of residential treatment services to pregnant women. Not less than 10 percent of the amount allotted for mental health services must be used to provide services and programs for seriously emotionally disturbed children and adolescents.

Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness and Mental Health Services to the Homeless Block Grant

The MHSH block grant program was authorized under the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987. This program was designed to provide funds to each State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories to support services to individuals who are chronically mentally ill and homeless. In 1990, Congress enacted the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act, which revised certain features of the program and authorized it under a new name, the PATH formula grant program. The PATH program was implemented in FY1991. PATH is designed to provide funds to each State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories to support services to individuals with severe mental illness, as well as individuals with both severe mental illness and substance use disorders, who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. Eligible services funded under PATH include screening and diagnostic treatment; outreach; habilitation and rehabilitation; community mental health; alcohol or drug treatment (for individuals with co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders); staff training; case management;

supportive and supervisory services in residential settings; and referrals for primary health care, job training, and education.

Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services Program for Children and Their Families Program

The Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children and Their Families program was authorized in 1992 in the ADAMHA Reorganization Act to provide grants to States, political subdivisions, Native American reservations, and tribal organizations for the provision of an array of community-based services organized into a system of care for children with serious emotional, behavioral, or mental disorders and their families. Funded initially at a level of \$4.9 million in FY1993, the appropriation was increased in FY1994 to \$35 million and to \$60 million in FY1995 and FY1996. FY1997 funding has been increased to approximately \$70 million. The purpose of the program is to plan, develop, and implement systems of care that are comprehensive, community-based, coordinated, family-focused, and culturally competent.

The individuals served by these systems of care are persons from birth to age 18, who currently or at any time during the past year, have had a diagnosable mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder of sufficient duration to meet the diagnostic criteria specified within DSM-IV, that resulted in functional disturbances. Approximately 14 to 20 percent (8 to 13 million) of all American children experience mental and emotional disturbances. Included in this group are approximately 3.5 million youngsters (5 percent of the child and adolescent population) who have serious emotional disturbances.

The Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children and Their Families program currently supports 22 grants to eligible entities. Communities are developing local systems of care, highlighting service collaboration among mental health, child welfare, education, juvenile justice, and other appropriate agencies. The program is ensuring that services that are currently underdeveloped or nonexistent in most communities, such as respite care; day treatment; therapeutic foster care; intensive home-, school-, or clinic-based services; emergency services; therapeutic case management; and diagnostic and evaluation services, are funded. Each child served through the program is receiving an individualized service plan developed with participation of the family (and where appropriate, the child). Each individualized plan designates a case manager to assist the child and family.

Protection and Advocacy Program for Individuals With Serious Mental Illness

The PAIMI Act of 1986 authorizes formula allotments to be awarded to P&A systems that have been designated by the Governor in each State to protect the rights of and advocate for individuals with disabilities. The allotments are to be used to pursue administrative, legal, and other appropriate remedies to redress complaints of abuse, neglect, and rights violations and to protect and advocate the rights of individuals with mental illness through activities to ensure the enforcement of the Constitution and Federal and State statutes.

The PAIMI programs have the authority to: (1) protect and advocate for the rights of persons with mental illness and (2) investigate reports of abuse and neglect in facilities that care for, or treat, individuals with mental illness. PAIMI programs may also address issues that arise during transportation to, admission to, or 90 days after discharge from, such facilities. Individuals eligible for services are those who have a significant mental illness or emotional impairment and who live in residential facilities. These facilities, which may be public or private, include hospitals, nursing homes, semi-independent or supervised community facilities, homeless shelters, jails, and prisons. P&As have special legal authority to access public and private facilities, meet with residents and clients, and maintain records for the purpose of conducting independent investigations of incidents of abuse and neglect.

Each P&A has a governing authority or board of directors with members who broadly represent and are knowledgeable about the needs of its clients. Also, they each have an Advisory Council to advise the P&A system on policies and priorities to be carried out in protecting and advocating the rights of individuals with

mental illness. Sixty percent of the council is composed of recipients or former recipients of mental health services or families of such persons.

Demonstration Grant Programs

The Community Partnership program, initiated in 1990, heralded a new approach for substance abuse prevention in the Nation. The program is predicated on the concept that empowered communities can marshal their resources to solve their own problems, such as substance abuse, violence, HIV/AIDS, drunk driving, school failure, and delinquency. Community Partnership grants permit representatives from government, business, health, religion, academia, schools, criminal justice, and other individuals to join together to assess, design, and implement communitywide prevention efforts. More than 30,000 nonprofit organizations and businesses have become associated with the 250 partnerships that have been funded. Partnership activities have resulted in a wide variety of policy and legislative change—from those that restrict access to substances to those that bring law enforcement closer to the community. Additional partnership accomplishments are many and include such outcomes as a decline in cases of Hepatitis B linked to intravenous drug use and a decline in alcohol-related boating deaths (Gloucester Prevention Network, Maine), a decline in drug-related misdemeanors (Southeast Queens Community Partnership), and closing of drug dealing locations (Tacoma Community Partnership, Washington; and Miami Coalition for a Drug Free Community, Florida). Many CSAP partnerships have become fully established in their communities, with stable organizational structures, self-sustaining funding sources, and representation and involvement from all sectors of the community.

Additional Demonstration Programs

SAMHSA (1992-1994) and its predecessor ADAMHA (1988-1991) supported several additional demonstration programs designed to expand services and knowledge about effective delivery of substance abuse and mental health services in distinct settings and to distinct groups of individuals with addictive and mental disorders. These programs included the Capacity Expansion, Target Cities, Critical Populations, Criminal Justice, Treatment Campus, HIV/AIDS Outreach, Women and Children, and National Capital Area Demonstration, and the DC Initiatives programs funded by SAMHSA's Center for Substance Abuse Treatment; the High Risk Youth and Pregnant and Postpartum Women and Infants programs funded by SAMHSA's Center for Substance Abuse Prevention; and the Access to Community Care and Effective Services and Support, Community Support, and AIDS demonstration programs funded by SAMHSA's Center for Mental Health Services.

Appendix B:

Additional Information on HRSA Programs

Community and Migrant Health Centers

These centers provide culturally sensitive, family-oriented preventive and primary health care services. They also provide essential ancillary services such as dental, laboratory test, x-ray, and pharmacy services. In addition, many centers provide other health and community services, such as transportation, nutrition, and health education. Health center services are tailored to meet the specific needs of the communities they serve, including the needs of special population groups (for example, the homeless, HIV-positive, and substance abusers).

Approximately 625 centers across the United States and its territories provide primary health care for approximately 7.0 million persons. For FY1994, the Community Health Centers program was appropriated \$603.7 million; the Migrant Health Centers program was appropriated \$59.0 million. Most centers also receive funding from State and local governments, Medicaid reimbursements, and other sources.

Maternal and Child Health Block Grant

The Maternal and Child Health (MCH) block grant program is a Federal and State partnership program designed to improve the health of mothers, children, and adolescents consistent with the National Health Objectives for the year 2000. The population served by these grants are primarily low-income, disadvantaged mothers and infant children. Services provided include the diagnosis and treatment of specific diseases or conditions, nutrition, periodic screening, and immunization services for children. The program provides health services for more than 11.6 million women, infants, and children with special health care needs.

A special set-aside of the block grant funds special projects of regional and national significance (SPRANS), by providing support for research in such areas as genetic diseases and hemophilia, and training for providers of such services.

Another maternal and child health-oriented program is the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) for Children program. The objectives of this program are to enhance and expand delivery of emergency medical services to acutely ill and seriously injured children. The goal is to reduce child and youth mortality and morbidity sustained as a result of severe acute illness or trauma.

In FY1994, the MCH block grant program was appropriated \$687.0 million. Of this amount, \$101.4 million was set aside for SPRANS projects. The EMS for Children program was appropriated \$7.5 million for FY1994.

Ryan White AIDS Services

Title XXVI, Part A, of the PHS Act authorizes grants for outpatient and ambulatory health and support services to metropolitan areas with a specified cumulative total of reported cases of AIDS or a specified per capita incidence of AIDS. Grantees are required to establish HIV health services planning councils to establish priorities for the allocation of funds within the eligible area, to develop a comprehensive plan for the organization and delivery of health services, and to assess the efficiency of the administrative mechanism in rapidly allocating funds to areas of greatest need within the eligible area.

Title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, Part B, authorizes grants for States and territories in support of systems of health care services for people with HIV infection. The State and territories programs provide

services through service delivery consortia in the localities most affected by HIV/AIDS. Services include home- and community-based care for individuals, continuation of health insurance coverage for low-income persons, and treatments that have been determined to prolong life or prevent serious deterioration of health.

This title (Part C) also authorizes the Early Intervention Services grants, which provide assessment and health services for mothers and their children infected with the HIV virus and uninfected siblings.

In FY1994, \$325.5 million was appropriated for Part A (metropolitan area grants), \$183.9 million was appropriated for Part B programs (State and territory grants), and \$48.0 million was appropriated for Part C (Early Intervention Services grants).

Health Care for the Homeless (HCH) Services

The HCH program provides access for homeless individuals to comprehensive, family-oriented primary care services, including immunizations and substance abuse services. Under this project grant program, all homeless individuals, including immigrants, are eligible for services. In FY1994, the HCH program was appropriated \$63.0 million. During the 1994 calendar year, HCH services were provided to approximately 450,000 homeless individuals.

Health Services for Residents of Public Housing

The Health Services for Residents of Public Housing program awards grants to local communities for the delivery of comprehensive, accessible, and affordable primary care services to public housing residents. The program was established through a cooperative effort with HUD and other appropriate Federal, State, and local organizations. In FY1994, the program was appropriated \$8.9 million. During calendar year 1992, 7 projects provided health care services to 18,017 individuals.

This page is intentionally left blank.

The President's Triennial Comprehensive Report on Immigration

Part IV

State Impacts

Prepared by:
U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service
Office of Policy and Planning

From data furnished by:
U.S. Bureau of the Census
Population Division

This page is intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR PART IV

Chapter 9: Immigrants in Selected States	193
--	-----

Tables

Table 1.—Total and Foreign-Born Population for the Seven States (Thousands)	193
Table 2.—Labor Force Participation Rate and Unemployment Rate for Foreign-Born Persons Aged 16 and Over in the United States and Selected States: 1990	194
Table 3.—Educational Attainment of the Foreign-Born Population Aged 25 and Over in the United States and Selected States: 1990	195
Table 4.—Measures of Income and Poverty of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States and Selected States: 1990	196
Table 5.—School Enrollment and English Language Ability of Persons Aged 5 to 17 in the United States and Selected States: 1990	198

This page is intentionally left blank.

Immigrants in Selected States

Most of the discussion in this Triennial Report has treated immigration at the national level: the volume of immigration nationwide, the contribution of immigration to total population growth, the impact of immigrants on the labor force, the extent to which immigrants participate in social service programs, and the cost of these services to the extent known. This is a necessary first approach to assessing the impact of immigration on the United States. Beyond this aspect, a full understanding of the topic requires consideration of the effects of immigration as they are experienced at the State and local level. Data on the social and economic characteristics of the foreign-born population are collected for small geographic areas in the decennial Census. This chapter presents data on that population for the seven States with the largest foreign-born populations in 1990. A review of the immigrants' characteristics at that time begins to indicate the likely nature of their impact on the communities in which they settle.

The seven States selected for this presentation are California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Texas. They contain the largest numbers of persons who arrived in the 1980's as well as the largest total foreign-born populations. In 1990, they contained 41.4 percent of the total U.S. population, but they accounted for 75.8 percent of the foreign-born population and 78.5 percent of those who had arrived during the previous decade. Table 1 repeats the basic information from the 1990 Census on the foreign-born population in those States.

TABLE 1.—Total and Foreign-Born Population for the Seven States (Thousands)

1990 Census						
State	Total Population	Foreign-Born Population			1980 Census Population	Change 1980-90
		Number	Percent	Entered 1980-90		
U.S. Total	248,710	19,767	7.9%	8,664	226,546	22,164
California	29,760	6,459	21.7%	3,256	23,668	6,092
New York	17,990	2,852	15.9%	1,190	17,558	432
Florida	12,938	1,663	12.9%	660	9,746	3,192
Texas	16,987	1,524	9.0%	718	14,229	2,758
New Jersey	7,730	967	12.5%	385	7,365	365
Illinois	11,431	952	8.3%	371	11,427	4
Massachusetts	6,016	571	9.5%	223	5,737	279
Balance of U.S.	145,858	4,776	3.3%	1,861	136,816	9,042
Seven States as percent of total	41.4%	75.8%		78.5%		

The analysis contributed by the Census Bureau in Chapter 2, Immigration and Population Change in the United States, indicates that the effect of immigration on the population growth of States is not distributed equally, and these States illustrate the point. Those in the Sun Belt (California, Florida, and Texas) grew rapidly during the 1980's, and arrivals from abroad were an important component of that growth. The other four States grew slowly or hardly at all, and Illinois, New Jersey, and New York would have experienced net losses in population if not for immigration. In most other States, the number of foreign-born persons and their proportion in the population is considerably smaller than in these seven. (In 1990, 14.7 percent of Hawaii's population consisted of foreign-born persons; however, this number represented relatively few persons compared with the seven States selected for this discussion. No other State's foreign-born population reached even 10 percent.) The impact of immigration—even at low levels—on a State with a small population can be significant, but in general, the greatest impact is felt where the largest number of foreign-born persons reside.

The material reviewed in the previous chapters has demonstrated the considerable diversity to be found within the immigrant population. The United States provides a great variety of contexts into which immigrants may settle, and immigrants with varying skills find appropriate places to live according to where their talents and resources are in demand. Often they settle among people who came earlier from the same country or the same part of the world, and who help the newer arrivals find jobs and places to live. Ethnic enclaves are created and grow in a way that can have a distinct impact on their communities once they reach a certain size. The characteristics of the immigrants living in a community will help to determine the nature of their impact. Because of the way immigrant communities grow, these characteristics are not distributed evenly.

In the important area of employment, foreign-born persons enumerated in the 1990 Census had a labor force participation rate of 64.3 percent, compared with 65.4 percent for the native-born population. In four of the seven selected States (Illinois, New Jersey, California, and Texas), the labor force participation rate of the foreign-born population was higher than the 64.3 percent average, while it was lower in Florida, Massachusetts, New York, and the balance of the United States. The unemployment rate among the foreign-born population was higher than the national average of 7.8 percent in Texas, California, Massachusetts, and New York, while it was lower in the other three States and in the balance of the country. This information is summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2.—Labor Force Participation Rate and Unemployment Rate for Foreign-Born Persons Aged 16 and Over in the United States and Selected States: 1990

Rate	State								Balance of U.S.
	Total U.S.	CA	FL	IL	MA	NJ	NY	TX	
Labor force participation rate*	64.3%	66.8%	60.9%	67.9%	62.3%	67.5%	62.7%	65.1%	61.7%
Unemployment rate (civilian)	7.8%	8.9%	7.4%	7.0%	8.4%	6.8%	8.1%	9.4%	6.0%

Some of these differences in the labor force participation and employment patterns of immigrants may lie in the differing qualifications they bring to the labor markets in the places where they settle. The amount of formal education presented by foreign-born persons living in the different States varies greatly, as shown in Table 3. The national average of immigrants who have less than a 9th grade education is 26.3 percent. This figure is considerably higher in Texas (43.1 percent) and California (31.3 percent) and slightly higher in Illinois (28.0 percent). In the other large States immigrants were less likely to have only a grade school education than the national average, and the figure for the small States comprising the balance of the United States was the most favorable, at 20.1 percent.

TABLE 3.—Educational Attainment of the Foreign-Born Population Aged 25 and Over in the United States and Selected States: 1990

Education Level	State								Balance of U.S.
	Total U.S.	CA	FL	IL	MA	NJ	NY	TX	
Percent with education of:									
Less than 9 th grade:	26.3	31.3	22.3	28.0	26.1	21.5	22.1	43.1	20.1
At least high school:	58.8	53.8	59.4	58.3	59.0	64.1	60.9	43.3	66.7
College degree or more:	20.4	18.4	15.4	21.3	21.9	24.5	19.6	15.2	25.2

The statistical profile for the States of residence of the best educated immigrants is consistent with the distribution of those with the least amount of education. In the country as a whole, 20.4 percent of the foreign-born persons enumerated in 1990 had a college degree or an even higher level of education. The percentage for most of the seven large States was below that level or slightly above it, with Texas being the lowest at 15.2 percent. New Jersey had the highest proportion of well-educated immigrants, with 24.5 percent, and in the balance of the country, 25.2 percent of the immigrants had at least a college education.

These differences in the education levels of foreign-born persons are generally reflected in their income levels by State, as shown in Table 4. Nationwide, the per capita income level of immigrants as measured in the 1990 Census was \$15,033. Texas, California, and Florida had the lowest per capita income of foreign-born persons in the large States, at \$10,537, \$13,596, and \$14,119 respectively. Per capita income was highest among the large States in New Jersey, at \$19,995. The picture differs slightly when household income is used as the measure. The median household income of foreign-born persons nationwide was \$28,320, and the median in Texas was the lowest at \$19,537. Household income was also low in Florida at \$24,010, but the median household income in California was above the national figure, at \$30,333. This indicates a larger than average household size among immigrants in California. New Jersey again showed the highest income level at \$37,628. Consistently, New Jersey was only half as likely as the national average to have foreign-born persons or families with incomes below the poverty level. In Texas, 32.2 percent of foreign-born persons and 30.5 percent of their families were living in poverty, compared with the national averages of 18.2 percent and 14.9 percent. Immigrants in California were slightly more likely to have poverty-level incomes than the national average.

A tabulation of the sources of household income of the foreign-born population as reported in the 1990 Census provides some insight into these income differentials by State. Nationwide, 81.7 percent of all households headed by immigrants reported having income from earnings (which could be wages from salaried employment or self-employment or both). In Texas and California, 88.5 percent and 86.1 percent respectively had income from earnings, indicating that the lower average incomes observed there were not because of a lack of employment. Relatively few immigrant households in Texas and California received Social Security or retirement income, consistent with the picture of a young, employed population. Florida and Massachusetts had the highest percentage of immigrant households receiving Social Security or retirement income.

TABLE 4.—Measures of Income and Poverty of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States and Selected States: 1990

Characteristic	State								Balance of U.S.
	Total U.S.	CA	FL	IL	MA	NJ	NY	TX	
Income:									
Per capita	\$15,033	\$13,596	\$14,119	\$16,764	\$16,844	\$19,995	\$17,026	\$10,537	\$16,264
Median household*	\$28,320	\$30,333	\$24,010	\$31,667	\$30,514	\$37,628	\$29,668	\$19,537	N/A
Households (%):									
<\$5,000	7.1	5.5	11.2	6.0	6.7	4.5	7.4	11.5	7.5
\$75,000+	10.5	11.1	6.8	10.6	11.2	16.8	11.8	5.0	10.6
Income below poverty level (%):									
Persons	18.2	20.0	15.6	13.6	13.9	9.2	15.9	32.2	16.9
Families	14.9	16.4	13.8	10.4	10.0	7.0	13.4	30.5	12.3
Households with (%):									
Earnings	81.7	86.1	75.6	84.2	76.2	83.7	78.6	88.5	78.9
Social Security income	21.6	15.3	29.3	21.0	28.8	23.3	24.5	13.1	25.4
Public assistance income	9.1	12.1	8.7	5.7	10.2	5.7	10.1	10.0	6.4
Retirement income	10.3	8.3	11.8	9.1	12.2	11.0	10.8	4.9	13.1

Nationwide, 9.1 percent of immigrant households were reported in the Census to be receiving income from public assistance programs, which could include Aid to Families with Dependent Children, General Assistance, or Supplemental Security Income (but not food stamps or Medicaid). In California, fully 12.1 percent of such households reported receiving this type of assistance, the highest of the large States. Use of public assistance at the rate of 10 percent or higher was also reported by households in Massachusetts, New York, and Texas. Reliance on these public programs was lowest in Illinois and New Jersey, at 5.7 percent, and was only 6.4 percent in the smaller States represented by the balance of the United States.

An important aspect of the impact of immigration on local communities is its impact on schools. Immigrant children and children born into immigrant families need classroom space, and depending on their language ability and their level of preparation, they may need special services before entering into the ongoing instructional program. Table 5 summarizes the information available from the Census that might provide a measure of the impact of immigration on the schools in the selected States.

Nationwide, 6.4 percent of children aged 5 to 17 and reported in the Census to be enrolled in either public or private school were born outside the United States. In California, the proportion was nearly three times as large, at 18.8 percent; New York was second among the large States at 11.8 percent. Outside the seven large States, only 2.6 percent of school enrollment consisted of foreign-born children. These figures document a large imbalance in the impact of immigration on the schools, and disaggregation of the data below the State level would no doubt show even greater contrasts at the level of the community and the school district.

Not all immigrant children are limited in their English ability, particularly after several years in the United States, and not all native-born children are fluent English speakers. The proportion of school enrollment that is limited in English ability, without regard to place of birth, generally follows the same pattern as the proportion of the foreign-born population but at a slightly lower level (see Table 5). The exception is Texas, where 7.1 percent of the school enrollment is foreign-born persons, and 11.9 percent is limited in English ability. The school enrollment percentage of both foreign-born persons and those limited in English ability is rather small nationwide (1.9 percent), but it is 7.5 percent in California. The contrast with the small States that make up the balance of the United States is substantial; in those States, only 0.6 percent of school enrollment is foreign born and limited in English ability.

This review of a few immigrant characteristics as they were distributed in 1990 among seven major States indicates one reason why no consensus exists regarding the impact of immigration: It varies in different locations, depending in part on the characteristics of the immigrants. For example, in California and Texas, the immigrant population has relatively little formal education and a higher than average unemployment rate. Despite immigrants in those two States being more likely to participate in the labor force and earn incomes than the national average, they are also more likely to be living in poverty and collecting public assistance payments. Schools in these States have a disproportionate enrollment of students whose English ability is limited. With these indicators, the impression of the impact of immigration gained from looking only at California and Texas is likely to be negative.

The impression from analyzing the immigrant population in a State such as New Jersey is entirely different. There, one-fourth of the adult immigrants have at least a college degree. Their labor force participation is high, and their unemployment is low. They are only half as likely to be in poverty as the average immigrant, and few receive public assistance. At 6.4 percent, the proportion of New Jersey's school enrollment that is limited in English ability is slightly higher than the national average of 5.6 percent. Overall, immigration appears in a favorable light if the judgment is based on the characteristics of immigrants living in New Jersey. In most of the small States, as shown in the Balance of the United States column in these tables, the characteristics of the immigrant population are more like those in New Jersey than those in California or Texas, and the numbers and proportion of the population are much smaller. The impact of immigration in most of the United States, then, is likely to be negligible and perceived as favorable to the extent that it is an issue.

TABLE 5.—School Enrollment and English Language Ability of Persons Aged 5 to 17 in the United States and Selected States: 1990

Characteristic	Total U.S.	State							Balance of U.S.
		CA	FL	IL	MA	NJ	NY	TX	
Percentage of school enrollment that is foreign-born and limited in English ability:	1.9	7.5	2.4	1.7	2.1	2.1	2.9	2.5	0.6
Percentage of school enrollment that is limited in English ability:	5.6	15.3	6.0	5.2	5.8	6.4	8.6	11.9	2.4
Percentage of school enrollment that are foreign-born persons	6.4	18.8	9.9	5.9	7.4	8.7	11.8	7.1	2.6
Percentage of college enrollment that are foreign-born persons (of any age):	10.8	24.2	16.2	10.4	11.8	14.9	19.0	10.7	5.4

The President's Triennial Comprehensive Report on Immigration

Part V

International Impacts

This page is intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR PART V

Chapter 10: Selected Economic Impacts of International Migration	199
Introduction	200
Travel and Passenger Fare Exports	200
Education Exports	201
Personal Remittances Abroad of the Foreign-Born Population	201
Table	
Table 1.—Selected U.S. International Accounts and Components* (millions of dollars).....	200
Chapter 11: The Foreign Policy Impact of Immigration	203
Abstract.....	203
Western Hemisphere.....	204
Mexico	204
Haiti.....	205
Dominican Republic	205
Cuba	205
Canada.....	206
Europe.....	206
Portugal	206
Poland	206
Ireland	207
Russia and Commonwealth of Independent States	207
Bosnia.....	207
Middle East.....	207
South Asia.....	208
East Asia.....	208
China	208
Hong Kong	209
Indochina	209
Africa	210

This page is intentionally left blank.

Selected Economic Impacts of International Migration

U.S. Department of Commerce
Bureau of Economic Analysis
Washington, DC 20230

Introduction

The Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) prepares estimates of four categories of international transactions (see Table 1) related to nonimmigrant and immigrant flows: travel expenditures in the United States by foreign visitors, their related passenger fares paid to U.S. carriers, education services to foreign students, and personal remittances by foreign-born residents in the United States to persons abroad. Travel, passenger fares, and education are major components of rapidly expanding exports of U.S. services, collectively accounting for more than 40 percent of the annual totals in FYs1990-1995. Personal remittances abroad by the foreign-born population in the United States are a major component of private unilateral transfers. BEA does not project economic activity for future years.

TABLE 1.—Selected U.S. International Accounts and Components* (millions of dollars)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
U.S. service exports	147,477	163,810	177,305	186,119	195,839	210,590
Travel exports	43,007	48,385	54,742	57,875	58,417	61,137
Passenger fares - exports	15,298	15,854	16,618	16,611	17,083	18,534
Other private services - exports	39,193	46,598	49,291	53,436	59,071	61,724
Education	5,126	5,679	6,186	6,738	7,175	7,517
Private remittances and other transfers, net	14,602	15,920	15,696	16,736	19,506	20,696
Personal remittances from the United States	8,395	9,051	9,437	10,190	10,934	11,846

* Account estimates appear in Table 1 of the international transactions presentation in the July 1996 issue of the Survey of Current Business: Services-line 3; Travel-line 5; Passenger fares-line 6; Other private sectors-line 9; and Private remittances and other transfers, net-line 32.

Travel and Passenger Fare Exports

Travel exports include aggregate purchases of goods (food and gifts) and services (lodging, recreation/entertainment, and local transportation) by foreign residents visiting the United States for less than 1 year for business or personal reasons. Expenditures by Canadian and Mexican visitors include border transactions that often involve short stays (some less than 24 hours). Passenger fare exports are fares received by U.S. operators for transporting foreign residents between the United States and a foreign country and between two foreign countries.

The method for estimating both travel and passenger fare exports combines data on the number of foreign travelers to the United States as provided by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), with average expenditures/passenger fares developed from the travel surveys conducted by the Tourism Industries Office of the International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Travel exports increased from \$43.0 billion in 1990 to \$61.1 billion in 1995. Passenger fare exports increased from \$15.3 billion in 1990 to \$18.5 billion in 1995. The three countries with the largest number of visitors to the United States in 1995 were Japan, the United Kingdom, and Canada.

Education Exports

Foreign students are defined as individuals enrolled in institutions of higher education in the United States who are not U.S. citizens, immigrants, or refugees. The value of these students' tuition, room and board, and living expenses are recorded as private service exports. Population totals and characteristics are obtained from annual surveys of accredited U.S. institutions conducted by the Institute for International Education. These data are matched with average tuition/room/board expenditures compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, to arrive at estimates of total education exports.

Education exports increased from \$5.1 billion in 1990 to \$7.5 billion in 1995. Students from Japan, China, Taiwan, and South Korea accounted for approximately 35 percent of the foreign student population in the United States during the 1990-1995 time period. Foreign students from India and Canada were also significant during this period.

Personal Remittances Abroad of the Foreign-Born Population

Personal remittances abroad by the foreign-born population in the United States are a major component of private unilateral transfers in U.S. international accounts. Remittance estimation is the aggregated product of three variables that are specified by country of nativity and duration of stay in the United States: population (converted to family units), average family income, and income propensity to remit abroad.

Foreign-born population levels and associated socioeconomic characteristics are obtained from the decennial censuses of 1980 and 1990, which identify population totals, family totals, and average family incomes by country of nativity and by duration of U.S. residency (in 5-year intervals). Annual interdecennial flows are based on data from the INS and the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey. These data are combined with remittance/income relationships of the foreign-born population (arrayed by country of nativity and 5-year intervals of U.S. residency) that were estimated from income and remittance questions on a sample survey of legalized aliens conducted by the INS for 1987 activity and a follow-up survey of the same sample conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor for 1991 activity. The source data and survey results support the following broad conclusions: a significant number of families do not remit, even for recent immigrants; the proportion of income remitted is significantly higher for persons from developing countries than from developed countries; the proportion of income remitted is highest in the initial years of U.S. residency and drops sharply thereafter; and the proportion of income remitted is higher for single foreign-born persons than for foreign-born persons with family in the United States.

Remittances increased from \$8.4 billion in 1990 to \$11.8 billion in 1995. More than 60 percent of remittances went to the countries of Central America, the Caribbean, and South America, but the influx of immigrants from Asia, the former Soviet Union, and Oceania increased remittances significantly to these areas during the period from 1990-1995.

This page is intentionally left blank.

The Foreign Policy Impact of Immigration

Abstract

Immigration issues continue to play an important role in the foreign relations of the United States. U.S. immigration laws have traditionally been generous, supporting family unification and providing a source of skilled laborers. Because of its democratic style of government and sound economic opportunities, the United States has long been the favored destination of large numbers of immigrants, and their participation in the fabric of American life has strengthened the relationships between their native countries and the United States.

Many countries strongly support a generous U.S. immigration policy, which provides an outlet for workers and professionals unable to find employment at home. Immigrants to the United States tend to send a portion of their earnings to family members at home, thereby providing an important source of foreign exchange as well as a stimulus to the growth of the local economies. As a result, many foreign governments pay close attention to U.S. immigration law and policy, and often lobby aggressively for liberal immigration benefits.

U.S. Department of State
Bureau of Consular Affairs
Washington, DC 20520

Western Hemisphere

The United States continues to be a magnet for immigrants from the Western Hemisphere. The relative geographic proximity and increasingly close economic relationships between the United States and its hemispheric neighbors have continued to promote immigration in recent years. The Western Hemisphere consistently accounts for the largest volume of immigration, by far, from any region of the world.

Civil unrest, weak economies, and occasional official or unofficial local government encouragement to emigrate help lengthen the immigration queues, especially from Latin America and the Caribbean. The growth of immigrant communities in the United States coupled with family-based immigration categories further increases the attractiveness of the United States as a destination country. Emigration serves as a safety valve to reduce social pressures in certain sending countries. Remittances to their homelands from legal and illegal immigrants are a significant source of foreign exchange for many home economies.

In the 1980's, between one-quarter and one-third of foreign adoptions by American citizens originated in the Western Hemisphere. Volume peaked at more than 40 percent in 1990 but has since declined both in actual numbers and as a percentage of the world total. Those numbers are expected to decline further in the foreseeable future as adoptions increase in other parts of the world.

The employment-based immigration categories established by the 1990 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) provide for the admission of greater numbers of skilled workers and smaller numbers of unskilled workers than previously. Persistent economic difficulties throughout our hemisphere that pressure workers, especially unskilled ones, to seek more promising employment opportunities in the United States sustain a tension between our immigration policies and the emigration interests of our neighbors. If public support of immigration wanes, as now seems likely, this tension may well increase, moving immigration higher on our bilateral agendas with several countries.

Mexico

Mexico, with a population of 90 million and an annual growth rate of nearly 2 percent, provides more legal and illegal immigrants to the United States than any other nation. More than a third of its population is less than 15 years of age and 80 percent is less than 40. Nearly 1 million Mexicans are awaiting authorization for immigrant visas in numerically limited categories that are over subscribed. So long as significant disparities in wages and job opportunities remain among the U.S. and Mexican labor markets, permanent or seasonal migration to the United States will continue to have strong appeal to Mexicans. Naturally enough, most illegal aliens from Central and South America, and increasingly from other countries as well, enter the United States from Mexico.

Immigration is a key bilateral issue between our two countries. While the United States seeks greater cooperation from Mexico in curbing the flow of illegal migrants, Mexico would like the United States to increase immigration numbers for Mexicans. Passage of Proposition 187 in California, which sought to limit benefits to illegal immigrants, struck a raw nerve in Mexico. The passage of Proposition 187 came at a particularly awkward time for the Mexican government, which presided over a severe slump in the Mexican economy.

The U.S.-Mexico Binational Commission is a cabinet-level body that meets annually to address issues of concern to both sides of the border. Its Working Group on Migration and Consular Affairs maintains a regular dialogue on immigration issues. A Border Liaison Mechanism was recently established to encourage regular, working-level contacts between U.S. and Mexican consuls and other government officials along the border to manage potential friction points before they become major problems.

The Immigration Act of 1990 (IMMACT90) spurred a major increase in immigrant visa demand by Mexicans. The Act provided immigrant visa authorizations for spouses and minor children of persons who benefited from the legalization programs of the 1980's, most of whom were Mexican.

Haiti

Immigration has long been an important issue in our bilateral relationship with Haiti, the most impoverished nation in the hemisphere. After the military coup in 1991, the U.S. Embassy in Port-au-Prince ceased issuing immigrant visas for a year. In-country refugee processing was initiated in February 1992 for Haitians who claimed political persecution. Immigrant visa operations were once again halted in August/September 1994 when all international flights to and from Haiti were suspended as part of the U.N. sanctions against Haiti. At various times, thousands of Haitians risked their lives in unsafe seacraft in attempts to sail to Florida.

The United States moved to stem the flow of migrants and to save lives on the high seas by rescuing migrants who refused return to Haiti and providing them with a safe haven at Guantanamo Bay Naval Station. At the same time, the use of U.S. visas by members of the regime was prohibited under Section 212(f) of INA. The subsequent U.S. military intervention, resulting in President Aristide's ultimate return to power, ended the exodus. Since the resumption of immigrant visa issuance in October of 1994, residents of Haiti have once again been offered the opportunity for safe and legal emigration.

Dominican Republic

Immigration to the United States by Dominicans has grown to record levels. In a nation of just 7 million inhabitants, nearly 40,000 receive immigrant visas each year. Unknown thousands more come to the United States illegally. In a May 1992 poll, 65 percent of Dominicans said they would leave their homeland if the trip did not risk their lives. Forty-two percent said they desired to leave the Dominican Republic regardless of the risk. The younger and poorer the respondent, the more likely the will to emigrate. The vast majority of Dominicans coming to stay in the United States join a thriving, if poor, Dominican community located primarily in the northeastern United States.

The growth in migration and the involvement of some immigrants in illegal activities have caused increasing concern over immigration patterns from the Dominican Republic to New York and Puerto Rico. The presence of Dominican narcotics traffickers in the United States has influenced our bilateral relationship; we have sought the cooperation of Dominican authorities to help control the movements of traffickers and illicit narcotics revenues between our two countries.

Cuba

Immigration is one of the few areas in which the U.S. government and the Cuban government have a formal bilateral agreement. The original agreement was signed in 1984 in the wake of the Mariel Boatlift. Since that time, immigrant visa and refugee processing at the U.S. Interests Section at Havana (USINT) has frequently been affected by the overall state of U.S.-Cuba relations. The Castro regime has alternated between obstruction and facilitation and has not hesitated to play the "migration card." In the summer of 1994, the Cubans stopped enforcing restrictions on departures. The resulting outflow of rafters into the Florida straits led to a new agreement that guaranteed that a total of 20,000 immigrant visa, refugee, and parole applicants would be processed at Havana and admitted to the United States each year and resulted in a new U.S. policy of returning rafters to Cuba (after asylum screening).

The issuance of immigrant visas averaged fewer than 2,000 per year from 1988-1994. The in-country refugee program, which had been expanded from the original program for long-term political prisoners to include human rights activists, members of persecuted religions, and others with a well-founded fear of persecution, processed 3,000 refugees in 1994. Under the 1994 agreement, immigrant visa and refugee cases will be augmented by parolees, some of which will be selected in a special lottery to reach the 20,000 annual minimum.

Before 1990, few Cubans were able to apply for nonimmigrant visas. That year, the Cuban government began easing restrictions on foreign travel. The result was a sharp increase in the number of nonimmigrant visa applications at USINT. Because many Cubans attempt to use the nonimmigrant visa as means of permanent entry into the United States, the nonimmigrant visa refusal rate is quite high.

Canada

Canadian and U.S. immigration officials have a history of close cooperation on immigration problems. Like the United States, Canada is a major immigrant and refugee resettlement country that also faces the serious problem of controlling the entry of an unprecedented wave of illegal immigrants and individuals seeking asylum, many with spurious claims. Recently, the Canadian government passed new comprehensive legislation that reforms Canadian immigration policy. In particular, the new legislation streamlines asylum processing. The Canadians have been very interested in European efforts to standardize asylum policies and have suggested similar efforts be made in North America. Canada and the United States have a continuing dialogue on asylum and immigration issues of mutual concern, particularly the question of how to reduce "asylum shopping."

Europe

Portugal

Since Portugal's inclusion in the European Union (EU), the Portuguese economy has made impressive gains and unemployment has held steady at just over 4 percent. Emigration from mainland Portugal has remained flat while emigration from the Azores has declined. However, immigration is still a significant issue in our relations.

Although an EU member, it appears unlikely that Azoreans will immigrate in any large numbers to Europe in the foreseeable future; family connections to the United States continue to be strong. While Azorean regional officials have discussed their concerns about immigration with members of the U.S. Congress, national-level officials rarely broach the subject in formal conversations. Portuguese officials raised questions regarding Portugal's exclusion from the AA-1 program. However, Portugal does participate in the successor immigration lottery program, the Diversity Visa (DV) Lottery.

As a member of the EU, Portugal is sensitive that it does not, as yet, qualify for the Visa Waiver Pilot Program. The nonimmigrant visa refusal rate remains too high for Portugal's inclusion.

Poland

Immigration issues have long been of major concern in Poland because of strong family ties with the Polish community in the United States. The elimination of travel restrictions in the post-Communist era, coupled with continuing difficult economic conditions as the country works to convert to a market-based economy, have kept demand for immigration to the United States high.

Poland benefited from the NP-5 lottery program and was a major beneficiary of the AA-1 transition diversity program, second only to Ireland in the number of visas issued. Beginning in FY1995, the AA-1 program is being replaced by the DV program, and Poland is a major beneficiary of the 55,000 visas authorized annually under the program. There was a great deal of interest in DV both in Poland and in the Polish community in the United States, even though the law limits each country to a maximum of 3,850 visas. However, if present immigration trends from Poland continue, Poland will no longer be eligible to participate in the DV program. Continuing Polish interest in immigration is also reflected in the high refusal rates for nonimmigrant visa applications at our posts in Poland.

Ireland

Developments in U.S. immigration law are of major importance to both the Irish government and public, and are a frequent topic in official discussions and parliamentary debate. Emigration patterns have been closely linked to Irish economic conditions. Legal immigration to the United States increased from 902 in 1981 to more than 10,000 in 1990, and the trend has continued upward. It is likely to decline somewhat with the end of the AA-1 program.

Ireland has benefited from several programs designed to increase diversity among the immigrant population to the United States. During the NP-5 program, which ran from FYs1987-1991, Ireland received 18,563 of the total of 52,239 visa numbers allocated under the program. Under the AA-1 program, which ran in FYs1992-1994, Ireland was allocated 40 percent of the 40,000 annual total of visas allocated. Under the new DV program, Ireland did not receive any preferential treatment, but demand is expected to remain strong.

Illegal Irish immigration also has been heavy and attracts high public interest in Ireland. The amnesty provisions of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 enabled very few Irish residents to legalize because most did not enter the United States until the late 1980's. However, many Irish illegals were able to take advantage of the NP-5 and AA-1 programs.

Russia and Commonwealth of Independent States

Since the demise of the Soviet Union, increased freedom of travel has become standard in most Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries. The number of Russian visa applicants has risen dramatically, yielding long lines at our Embassy and Consulates. Because of the uncertainty of the economic and political situation in Russia, many applicants are unable to qualify for visas. This has resulted in a number of complaints from the Government of Russia.

In the CIS countries, visa demand remains relatively low, though it will likely begin to increase as the political situation becomes more stable, and the economies begin to prosper.

The United States continues to operate a major refugee resettlement program from the former Soviet Union (up to 45,000 admissions from the former Soviet Union in FY1994) in categories of religious minorities prescribed by statute and other individuals of concern.

Bosnia

A Bosnian refugee admissions program was established in FY1993 for Bosnians of special humanitarian concern to the United States. Those eligible are vulnerable Bosnian Muslims referred for resettlement by United Nations' High Commission on Refugees, such as former detainees, torture victims, and women victims of violence, as well as Bosnian Muslim relatives of U.S. citizens, lawful permanent residents, asylees, or refugees. Up to 10,000 Bosnians were expected to be admitted to the United States as refugees in FY1994.

Middle East

Immigration to the United States from the Gulf States is limited, primarily involving expatriate guest workers and professionals whose immigration to the United States has no bearing on U.S.-Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) bilateral relations. In the wake of the Gulf War, most GCC countries reduced the numbers of guest workers from other Arab states and repatriated many of those from countries that had either supported Iraq outright or were considered sympathetic to Baghdad.

In Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt, depressed economies continued to create pressures for emigration, particularly to the United States. The return home of Egyptian, Jordanian, and Palestinian guest workers

from the Gulf further added to this impetus. The exodus of Lebanese during the 16-year civil war continued to have derivative effects, as family members joined "anchors" already in the United States. Iraq's lifting of a 10-year travel ban on its citizens allowed Iraqis who had long since qualified for immigrant status to process their cases.

Terrorism by radical Islamic groups, especially the World Trade Center bombing in New York, and concerns about the potential for future acts of terrorism resulted in stricter security measures in the screening of immigrants worldwide. These measures included improved name check capabilities at overseas U.S. missions.

Israel faced problems integrating the huge influx of immigrants from the former Soviet Union into Israeli society. Many have subsequently sought onward emigration to the United States, to the concern of the Government of Israel.

The number of Iranian refugees has declined, with only about 800 admissions in FY1994. Post-Gulf War refugee processing for Iraqis continued in Turkey and processing posts in Europe, and from camps in Saudi Arabia. The ceiling for the Middle East/South Asia region for FY1994 was 6,000.

South Asia

Emigration from India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh continues at high levels. While many immigrants from South Asia arrive bearing family- or employment-based visas, illegal immigration through identity or document fraud remains significant.

In India, explosive economic growth in certain sectors, especially the computer industry, has sparked an ever-rising demand for employment-related nonimmigrant visas as the Indian computer sector develops links with its U.S. counterpart. Although such visas do not immediately bestow U.S. permanent residence on the bearer, in practice, many such visa holders subsequently adjust status to U.S. permanent residence and eventually become U.S. citizens. Large numbers of Indian students coming to the United States for university education also eventually adjust to U.S. permanent resident status. The movement of Indian computer experts and students comes in addition to well established immigration patterns generated by natives of India already in the United States, thus maintaining immigration from India at significant levels.

Similarly, immigration from Pakistan continues unabated. Nearly all classes of Pakistani society, from the wealthiest landlords and cash-rich businessmen to upper middle class professionals and those with any marketable employment skills at all, think in terms of emigrating from Pakistan. Children of some of Pakistan's most influential political families live abroad, and some high-ranking civil servants have U.S. or British permanent resident status. Moreover, there are large numbers of unemployed and underemployed young men and women in Pakistan, even those with some technical and professional skills, who are eager to seek better prospects outside Pakistan.

The admissions program for Afghan refugees ended in FY1993.

East Asia

China

In the wake of the June 1989 events in Tiananmen Square, President Bush issued Executive Order 12711 on April 11, 1990. That order allowed Peoples Republic of China nationals who were present in the United States on or after June 5, 1989, through April 11, 1990, to remain in the United States and not be forced to return to China against their will before January 1, 1994. The Chinese Student Protection Act of 1992

permitted approximately 54,000 Chinese nationals to apply for adjustment to permanent resident alien status during a 12-month period beginning July 1, 1993. That law accorded beneficiaries status in the employment third-preference classification (for skilled workers) and subjected them to the statutory worldwide numerical limit on immigrants in that preference.

Before June 1989, Chinese students had already become the largest foreign student population in the United States. The experience of our Embassy in Beijing and consulates general in Guangzhou, Shanghai, Chengdu, and Shenyang is that Chinese students generally prolong their stay in the United States as long as possible, first exhausting all educational opportunities and then seeking legal means to adjust status.

China posts are seeing a dramatic increase in fraudulent employment-based nonimmigrant visa applications. Guangzhou reports that many applications in this visa category are based on fraudulent or nonexistent businesses, fraudulent job offers, or are from applicants who do not have the requisite experience for the petitioned employment.

The link of Chinese organized crime to Chinese alien smuggling has been of particular concern to a number of government agencies. Efforts to engage the Chinese government and other countries with known staging areas for smuggling Chinese into the United States have increased significantly since 1990.

Changes in Chinese adoption law in 1991 and 1992 resulted in a steadily increasing number of Americans traveling to China to adopt infants. Initial disagreements among Chinese ministries fighting for the lead in adoption issues tangled many adoptive parents in bureaucratic red tape. The Chinese government finally shut off foreign adoptions completely while they worked out internal disputes. Foreign adoptions have resumed, and Guangzhou now issues more adoption visas than any other post worldwide.

Hong Kong

Hong Kong reverted to Chinese sovereignty on July 1, 1997. A special immigrant visa program established by Section 124 of IMMACT90 provided immigration opportunities for Hong Kong-based employees of U.S. firms. The law was to permit applicants to use the visas as a safety net, requiring them to have immigrated before January 1, 2002. Unexpectedly, the program did not generate the interest its drafters had anticipated. With 36,000 visas available during the 3-year period, only 7,626 of these special immigrant visas were issued.

Indochina

The protection and resettlement of Indochinese refugees remains a significant concern of U.S. policy toward East Asia. The United States is working closely with both first asylum and resettlement nations and with the UNHCR to resolve the situation of the remaining Indochinese refugees in the first asylum countries in Southeast Asia and Hong Kong. Under the Comprehensive Plan of Action adopted by the 1989 International Conference on Indochinese refugees, the United States and other resettlement countries have pledged to resettle newly arriving asylum seekers who are determined to be bona fide refugees. The Comprehensive Plan has been successful in dramatically reducing new arrivals and facilitating voluntary repatriation. Most of the U.S. caseload of Vietnamese refugees in the first asylum camps of Southeast Asia and Hong Kong will have been admitted by the end of FY1994, leaving only a small residual caseload to be completed in 1995. The U.S. Orderly Departure Program (ODP) from Vietnam is a major area of cooperation between our two countries, allowing for the processing of former reeducation camp prisoners, former U.S. Government employees, former employees of private U.S. organizations, and Amerasian refugees, for resettlement in the United States. Immigrant visa beneficiaries are also processed under the ODP. Up to 45,000 Vietnamese were expected to be admitted as refugees in FY1994.

If the United States and Vietnam normalize relations, the resulting business and trade will continue the flow of Vietnamese immigrants at a lower but steady rate. The large Vietnamese American community presents an opportunity for business contacts. It also represents a continued impetus for immigration as Vietnamese

Americans seek to bring their relatives to this country. One can also expect some Vietnamese Americans traveling to Vietnam to marry Vietnamese citizens and start a new round of immigration for their spouses and eventually in-laws. These two trends of immigration and business, each contributing to the other, will tie the two nations closer together and make each a more significant concern for the other's foreign policy.

Africa

Although immigration to the United States from Africa has risen somewhat in recent years, Africa nevertheless accounts for a relatively small percentage of immigrants to the United States. Just three countries—Nigeria, Ghana, and Ethiopia—are the source of more than two-thirds of all immigrants from Africa. There has also been considerable interest from these countries in the DV program.

Political upheavals throughout the continent have created large populations of displaced persons who are eager to take advantage of available opportunities to emigrate to the United States, whether through family-based immigrant visa petitions or through refugee or asylee status. In addition, government officials and rebel leaders from several African countries have strong family connections in the United States, sometimes causing friction as immigration benefits gained through family relationships come into conflict with U.S. foreign policy considerations.

U.S. refugee admissions for Africa have remained at about 7,000 a year. These are primarily Somalis, Sudanese, Liberians, and Ethiopians. Most of the processing is carried out in Kenya.

Acronyms and Glossary

This page is intentionally left blank.

Acronyms

ABC	American Baptist Churches
ACF	Administration for Children and Families
ADAMHA	Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration
ADD	Administration of Developmental Disabilities
ADMS	Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services
AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
AIDS	acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
AIG	American International Group
AoA	Administration on Aging
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis
CACFP	Child and Adult Care Food Program
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CMHS	Center for Mental Health Services
CPS	Current Population Survey
CSPA	Chinese Student Protection Act
CPST	Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology
CSBG	Community Services Block Grant
CSE	Child Support Enforcement
DHHS	Department of Health and Human Services
DOC	Department of Commerce
DOEd	Department of Education
DOL	Department of Labor
DOS	Department of State
DV	Diversity Visa
EA	Emergency Assistance
EC	Enterprise Communities
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPR	employment-to-population ratio
ESA	Employment Standards Administration
EU	European Union
EWI	entries without inspection
EZ	Empowerment Zones
FCS	Food and Consumer Service
FLCs	farm labor contractors
FPL	Federal poverty level
FSP	Food Stamp Program
FY	fiscal year
GA	General Assistance
GAO	General Accounting Office
GCC	U.S.-Gulf Cooperation Council
GMA	General Medical Assistance
HCFA	Health Care Financing Administration
HIV	human immunodeficiency virus
HRSA	Health Resources and Services Administration
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
IIRIRA	Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act
IMMACT90	Immigration Act of 1990
INA	Immigration and Nationality Act

INS	Immigration and Naturalization Service
IRCA	Immigration Reform and Control Act
IQCS	Integrated Quality Control System
LCA	Labor Condition Application
LEP	limited English proficient
LIHEAP	Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program
LIRS	Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service
LPS2	Second Legalized Persons Survey
MCH	Maternal and Child Health
MHSH	Mental Health Services to the Homeless
MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area
NAS	National Academy of Sciences
NSCG	National Survey of College Graduates
NSLP	National School Lunch Program
NSF	National Science Foundation
OCS	Office of Community Services
ODP	U.S. Orderly Departure Program
OIG	Office of the Inspector General
ORR	Office of Refugee Resettlement
P&A	Protection and Advocacy
PAIMI	Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness
PATH	Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness
PHS	Public Health Service
PLC	Permanent Labor Certification
PNS	Projects of National Significance
PRC	People's Republic of China
PRUCOL	permanently residing in the United States under color of law
PRWORA	Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act
RCA	Refugee Cash Assistance
RMA	Refugee Medical Assistance
RSDI	Social Security Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance
S&E	science and engineering
SAMHSA	Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
SAPT	Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment
SAVE	Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements
SAW	Special Agricultural Worker
SBP	School Breakfast Program
SDR	Survey of Doctorate Recipients
SED	Survey of Earned Doctorates
SEIU	Service Employees International Union
SFSP	Summer Food Service Program
SOFTPAC	Software Professionals Political Action Committee
SPRANS	special projects of regional and national significance
SSA	Social Security Administration
SSBG	Social Services Block Grant
SSDI	Social Security disability insurance
SSI	Supplemental Security Income
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
TFP	Thrifty Food Plan
TPS	Temporary Protected Status
UAP	University Affiliated Programs
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission on Refugees
USCC	United States Catholic Conference
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture

USINT
WHD
WIC

U.S. Interests Section
Wage and Hour Division
Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children

This page is intentionally left blank.

Glossary

Adjustment to Immigrant Status—Procedure allowing certain aliens already in the United States to apply for immigrant status. Aliens admitted to the United States in a nonimmigrant or other category may have their status changed to that of lawful permanent resident if they are eligible to receive an immigrant visa and one is immediately available. In such cases, the alien is counted as an immigrant as of the date of adjustment, even though the alien may have been in the United States for an extended period of time.

Agricultural Workers—As a nonimmigrant class of admission, an alien coming temporarily to the United States to perform agricultural labor or services, as defined by the Secretary of Labor. This nonimmigrant category was established as a separate class of admission by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.

Alien—Any person not a citizen or national of the United States.

Amerasian (Vietnam)—Immigrant visas are issued to Amerasians under Public Law 100-202 (Act of December 22, 1987), which provides for the admission of aliens born in Vietnam between January 1, 1962, and January 1, 1976, if the alien was fathered by a U.S. citizen. Spouses, children, and parents or guardians may accompany the alien.

Asylee—An alien in the United States or at a port-of-entry unable or unwilling to return to his or her country of nationality, or to seek the protection of that country because of persecution or a well founded fear of persecution. Persecution or the fear thereof may be based on the alien's race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. For persons with no nationality, the country of nationality is considered to be the country in which the alien last habitually resided. Asylees are eligible to adjust to lawful permanent resident status after 1 year of continuous presence in the United States. These immigrants are limited to 10,000 adjustments per fiscal year.

Cuban/Haitian Entrant—Status accorded 1) Cubans who entered the United States illegally between April 15, 1980, and October 10, 1980, and 2) Haitians who entered the country illegally before January 1, 1981. Cubans and Haitians meeting these criteria who have continuously resided in the United States since before January 1, 1982, and who were known to the INS before that date, may adjust to permanent residence under a provision of the Immigration Control and Reform Act of 1986.

Diversity Transition—A transition toward the permanent diversity program in FY1995, allocating 40,000 visas annually during the period 1992 to 1994 to nationals of certain countries identified as having been "adversely affected" by the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965 (P.L. 89-236). At least 40 percent of the visas must be allocated to natives of Ireland.

Immediate Relatives—Certain immigrants who because of their close relationship to U.S. citizens are exempt from the numerical limitations imposed on immigration to the United States. Immediate relatives are: spouses of citizens, children (under 21 years of age) of citizens, parents of citizens 21 years of age or older, and orphans adopted by citizens who are at least 21 years of age.

Immigrant—An alien admitted to the United States as a lawful permanent resident. Immigrants are those persons lawfully accorded the privilege of residing permanently in the United States. They may be issued immigrant visas by the Department of State overseas or adjusted to permanent resident status by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the United States.

Immigration Act of 1990—Public Law 101-649 (Act of November 29, 1990), which increased total immigration to the United States under an overall flexible cap, revised all grounds for exclusion and deportation, authorized temporary protected status to aliens of designated countries, revised and established new nonimmigrant admission categories; revised and extended the Visa Waiver Pilot Program; and revised naturalization authority and requirements.

Immigration Marriage Fraud Amendments of 1986—Public Law 99-639 (Act of November 10, 1986), which was passed in order to deter immigration-related marriage fraud. Its major provision stipulates that aliens deriving their immigrant status based on a marriage of less than 2 years are conditional immigrants. To remove their conditional status the immigrants must apply at an Immigration and Naturalization Service office during the 90-day period before their second-year anniversary of receiving conditional status. If the aliens cannot show that the marriage through which the status was obtained was and is a valid one, their conditional immigrant status is terminated and they become deportable.

Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986—Public Law 99-603 (Act of November 6, 1986), which was passed in order to control and deter illegal immigration to the United States. Its major provisions stipulate legalization of undocumented aliens, legalization of certain agricultural workers, sanctions for employers who knowingly hire undocumented workers, and increased enforcement at U.S. borders.

Immigration and Nationality Act—The Act, which along with other immigration laws, treaties, and conventions of the United States, relates to the immigration, exclusion, deportation, or expulsion of aliens.

Intracompany Transferee—An alien, employed by an international firm or corporation, who seeks to enter the United States temporarily in order to continue to work for the same employer, or a subsidiary or affiliate, in a capacity that is primarily managerial, executive, or involves specialized knowledge.

National—A person owing permanent allegiance to a State.

Naturalization—The conferring, by any means, of citizenship upon a person after birth.

Nonimmigrant—An alien who seeks temporary entry to the United States for a specific purpose. The alien must have a permanent residence abroad (for most classes of admission) and qualify for the nonimmigrant classification sought. The nonimmigrant classifications are: foreign government officials, visitors for business and for pleasure, aliens in transit through the United States, treaty traders and investors, students, international representatives, temporary workers and trainees, representatives of foreign information media, exchange visitors, fiance(e)s of U.S. citizens, intracompany transferees, and NATO officials. Most nonimmigrants can be accompanied or joined by spouses and unmarried minor (or dependent) children..

Nonpreference Category—Nonpreference visas were available to qualified applicants not entitled to one under the other preferences until the category was eliminated by the Immigration Act of 1990. Nonpreference visas for persons not entitled to the other preferences had not been available since September 1978 because of high demand in the preference categories. An additional 5,000 nonpreference visas were available in each of FY1987 and 1988 under a provision of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. This program was extended into 1989, 1990, and 1991 with 15,000 visas issued each year. Aliens born in countries from which immigration was adversely affected by the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89-236) were eligible for the special nonpreference visas.

Parolee—An alien, appearing to be inadmissible to the inspecting officer, allowed to enter the United States under emergency (humanitarian) conditions or when that alien's entry is determined to be in the public interest. Parole does not constitute a formal admission to the United States and confers temporary admission status only, requiring parolees to leave when the conditions supporting their parole cease to exist. Types of parolees since 1992 include the following:

- 1) **Deferred inspection**—Parole may be granted to an alien who appears not to be clearly admissible to the inspecting officer. An appointment will be made for the alien's appearance at another Service office where more information is available and the inspection can be completed.
- 2) **Advance parole**—Authorized at an INS District office in advance of alien's arrival.
- 3) **Port of entry parole**—Authorized at the port upon alien's arrival.
- 4) **Humanitarian parole**—Authorized at INS headquarters, for example, granted to an alien who has a serious medical condition which would make detention or immediate return inappropriate.
- 5) **Public interest parole**—Authorized at INS headquarters, for example, granted to an alien who is a witness in legal proceedings or is subject to prosecution in the United States.
- 6) **Overseas parole**—Authorized at an INS District or suboffice while the alien is still overseas.

Per-Country Limit—The maximum number of family-sponsored and employment-based preference visas that can be issued to any country in a fiscal year. The limits are calculated each fiscal year depending on the total number of family-sponsored and employment-based visas available. No more than 7 percent of the visas may be issued to natives of an independent country in a fiscal year; dependencies of independent countries cannot exceed 2 percent. The per-country limit does not indicate, however, that a country is entitled to the maximum number of visas each year, just that it cannot receive more than that number. Because of the combined workings of the preference system and per-country limits, most countries do not reach this level of visa issuance.

Permanent Resident Alien—See Immigrant.

Port of Entry—Any location in the United States or its territories which is designated as a point of entry for aliens and U.S. citizens. All INS district offices are also considered ports because they become locations of entry for aliens adjusting to immigrant status.

Preference System (before FY1992)—The 6 categories among which 270,000 immigrant visa numbers are distributed each year during the period 1981-91. This preference system was amended by the Immigration Act of 1990, effective FY1992. (See Preference System (Immigration Act of 1990).) The six categories were: unmarried sons and daughters (over 21 years of age) of U.S. citizens (20 percent); spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence (26 percent); members of the professions or persons of exceptional ability in the sciences and arts (10 percent); married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens (10 percent); brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens over 21 years of age (24 percent); and needed skilled or unskilled workers (10 percent). A nonpreference category, historically open to immigrants not entitled to a visa number under one of the six preferences just listed, had no numbers available beginning in September 1978.

Preference System (Immigration Act of 1990)—The nine categories since FY1992 among which the family-sponsored and employment-based immigrant preference visas are distributed. The family-sponsored preferences are: 1) unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens; 2) spouses, children, and unmarried sons and daughters of permanent resident aliens; 3) married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens; 4) brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The employment-based preferences are: 1) priority workers (persons of extraordinary ability, outstanding professors and researchers, and certain multinational executives and managers); 2) professionals with advanced degrees or aliens with exceptional ability; 3) skilled workers, professionals (without advanced degrees), and needed unskilled workers; 4) special immigrants; and 5) employment creation immigrants (investors).

Refugee—Any person who is outside his or her country of nationality who is unable or unwilling to return to that country because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution. Persecution or the fear thereof may be based on the alien's race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. People with no nationality must be outside their country of last habitual residence to qualify as a refugee. Refugees are exempt from numerical limitation (though worldwide ceilings by geographic area are set annually by the President) and are eligible to adjust to lawful permanent residence after one year of continuous presence in the United States.

Refugee Approvals—The number of refugees approved for admission to the United States during a fiscal year. Refugee approvals are made by Immigration and Naturalization Service officers in overseas offices.

Refugee Arrivals—The number of refugees the Immigration and Naturalization Service initially admits to the United States through ports of entry during a fiscal year.

Special Immigrants—Certain categories of immigrants who were exempt from numerical limitation before fiscal year 1992 and subject to limitation under the employment-based fourth preference beginning in 1992: persons who lost citizenship by marriage; persons who lost citizenship by serving in foreign armed forces; ministers of religion, their spouses and children; certain employees and former employees of the U.S. Government abroad, their spouses and children; Panama Canal Act immigrants; certain foreign medical school graduates, their spouses and children; certain retired employees of international organizations, their spouses and children; juvenile court dependents; certain aliens serving in the U.S. Armed Forces, their spouses and children; and religious workers, their spouses and children.

Student—As a nonimmigrant class of admission, an alien coming temporarily to the United States to pursue a full course of study in an approved program in either an academic (college, university, seminary, conservatory, academic high school, elementary school, other institution, or language training program) or a vocational or other recognized nonacademic institution.

Suspension of Deportation—A discretionary benefit adjusting an alien's status from that of deportable alien to one lawfully admitted for permanent residence. Application for suspension of deportation is made during the course of a deportation hearing before an immigration judge.

Treaty Trader or Investor—As a nonimmigrant class of admission, an alien coming temporarily to the United States, under the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation between the United States and the foreign state of such alien, to carry on substantial trade or to direct the operations of an enterprise in which he has invested a substantial amount of capital, and the alien's spouse and unmarried minor (or dependent) children.

Worldwide Ceiling—The numerical limit imposed on immigration visa issuance worldwide beginning in FY1979 and ending in FY1991. The ceiling in 1991 was 270,000 visa numbers. Prior to enactment of Public Law 96-212 on March 17, 1980, the worldwide ceiling was 290,000.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Appendix

This page is intentionally left blank.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

October 4, 1996

Mr. Robert L. Bach
Executive Associate Commissioner
for Policy and Planning
Immigration and Naturalization Service
U.S. Department of Justice
425 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20536

Dera Mr. Bach:

On behalf of Administrator Carol Browner, I would like to report that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has no contribution for the President's Comprehensive Triennial Report on Immigration.

If you have any questions, please call me at 202-260-4870.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alan Hecht", with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Alan Hecht
Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator

cc: David Berman



Recycled/Recyclable
Printed with Soy/Canola Ink on paper that
contains at least 50% recycled fiber



U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D.C. 20410-0500

November 8, 1996

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. Robert L. Bach
Executive Associate Commissioner
for Policy and Planning
Immigration and Naturalization Service
425 Eye Street N.W.
Washington, D.C., 20536

Dear Mr. Bach:

This is in response to your letter of August 17, 1996, requesting information from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the President's Triennial Comprehensive Report on Immigration, which is scheduled for publication on March 10, 1997.

As was mentioned by Sara Manzano in her recent telephone conversation with you, HUD implemented its noncitizen rule restricting the provision of housing assistance to noncitizens in March of 1995, and while HUD is actively engaged in carrying out the requirements of that rule, HUD, at present, has only very preliminary information relating to the rule's implementation. In addition, HUD is currently in the process of amending the rule to implement statutory changes made in the recently passed Immigration Reform Act.

As it is the noncitizen rule that would provide the basis for any HUD information of relevance to the Triennial Comprehensive Immigration Report, due to the rule's recent implementation and current rule changes HUD will not be providing information for the Report.

Should you have the need for information on HUD and immigration related matters in the future, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nelson A. Diaz", is written over the typed name.

Nelson A. Diaz