since this is more easily corrected than lack of jobs in areas where housing was available.

The BRC's new information that many of the refugees were employed in the reception centres makes the unemployment figures quoted even more staggering, but it does not detract from our surprise as Canadians at the high ratio of employees to assisted refugees.

With respect to the assertion of cavalier writing re our comment that the Ockenden Venture "grew from a very small agency", we can only quote from the report published by the British Home Office from which the comment was drawn: 'The subsequent months saw Ockenden expand rapidly in size from what had been a very small organization...". It is not cavalier to accurately represent a British government report. Similarly, it may be much more accurate to detail the specific north, north-eastern and eastern areas of Great Britain, but the use of a more general geographical terminology is not cavalier.

Concerning British representatives at international conferences who argue that resettlement of refugees is no longer a viable alternative, I assure you that it was not Mr. Jones nor the other writers, though it was stated in my presence by two British representatives at an international conference that both Mr. Barber and I attended.

Finally, we invite any of the British correspondents to write a review article on any Canadian reports or on our settlement policy and we would be pleased to publish it.

The Editor.

U.S. News

Senate Appropriations Committee Restores $25 Million for Refugees

The Senate Appropriations Committee chaired by Sen. Mark Hatfield (R-OR) marked-up the Foreign Operations Appropriation bill and restored $25 million to the Migration and Refugee Assistance fund which had been earlier deleted by Senate conservatives. This fund contains both domestic resettlement grants and international refugee assistance.

* * *

Humanitarian Aid to Central American Refugees

A report prepared at the request of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary found urgent humanitarian needs among a total of 754,200 refugees and displaced persons in Central America and called for increased humanitarian assistance to the area. Senator Edward M. Kennedy requested the report as Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee.

* * *

Reagan's Refugee Ceilings

The 72,000 worldwide refugee admission ceiling shall be allocated among the regions of the world as follows: 50,000 for East Asia; 12,000 for the Soviet Union/Eastern Europe; 6,000 for the Near East/South Asia; 3,000 for Africa; and 1,000 for Latin America/Caribbean; and an additional 5,000 refugee admission numbers shall be made available for the adjustment to permanent residence status of aliens who have been granted asylum in the United States, as this is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest.

Refugee Welfare Dependancy Rates in the U.S.

In the December 1982 issue of *Refuge* (Vol. 2, No. 2), we published an article criticizing the distorted use of refugee dependency rates in the U.S. Congress. The Refugee Policy Group published an analysis of the meaning of 'Welfare Dependency Rates as an Indication of the Adaptation of Indochinese Refugees in the U.S.'

The most recent increases in welfare dependency rates can be attributed fully to methodological and statistical variation rather than an actual change in patterns of welfare use. The seeming increase in welfare dependency from 1979 to 1981 was caused by two inter related factors:

• Changes in the distribution of the refugee population from greater proportions of older arrivals to greater proportions of new arrivals.

• The Refugee Act of 1980 restricted eligibility for refugee programme welfare benefits to not more than 36 months, resulting in a change in the time-frames used to calculate the welfare dependency rate.*

The seeming increase in welfare dependency rates was compounded by other changes in calculation methods that caused an overestimate in the 1981 rate.

Until 1981, the welfare dependency rate was calculated from data collected from all states participating in the refugee programme. In 1981, however, the statistic was based on a survey of nine states. Since these states actually accounted for a larger share of eligible refugees in 1981 than they did in previous years, it is likely that there were fewer refugee welfare recipients nationwide than was assumed.**

Further, included in the welfare recipient population in the 1981 survey were non-Indochinese and non-Cuban refugees, but these other groups were not included in the number of eligible refugees. Had the non-Indochinese refugees been removed from the recipient category or added to the eligible category, the welfare dependency rate would have been lower.

The welfare dependency rate of refugees who arrived in 1975 was lower during their first 36 months in the U.S. than that of refugees who have arrived within the last three years.

However, it is important to understand that the majority of 1975 arrivals were educated at the secondary or university level while the majority of post-1979 arrivals have had little or no education. The overall welfare dependency rate for each group has reflected the experiences of the dominant class within that group.

By adding a control factor for education level in calculating welfare dependency rates, much of the variation between pre and post 1979 arrivals would be eliminated.

Because of the susceptibility of these aggregate welfare dependency rates to variations caused by statistical factors, they are not the best statistics by which to measure the effectiveness of the refugee programme. It is likely, though, that welfare utilization patterns will continue to influence perceptions about refugee resettlement. Changes in methods of calculation should therefore be considered.

H.A.

*This change took effect on April 2, 1981.
**In reviewing this paper, an ORR representative notes that an adjustment factor was used, but that it underestimated the change in population size.