

Forex Report Daily

Half of Immigrant Households Used At Least One Welfare Program

Alex Crown
September 3, 2015

The survey shows immigrant households use welfare at significantly higher rates than native households, even higher than indicated by other Census surveys.

These numbers improve for households with youngsters, with 76% of immigrant-led households receiving welfare, in comparison with 52% for the native-born.

A report released on September 2 indicates that 51 percent of households headed by an immigrant (whether legal or illegal) reported that they used at least one welfare program during the past year.

Camarota found that both newly-arrived immigrants and immigrants who have been in the USA for many years use welfare programs more than natives. “Some safety-net programs are very responsive to overall economic conditions”.

Barring the export of crude oil benefits a handful of politically connected companies and nobody else. The report discovered that 87% of immigrant households had a minimum of one employee, in comparison with 76% for native households. “If you want to undo that, you have to vigorously enforce your immigration laws and, more important, turn to a very selective immigration system because one of the key findings is that the welfare use rates for the less educated are extremely high”, he said. “The low-skill level of many immigrants means that although most work, many also access welfare programs”.

“The overwhelming majority of immigrant households using welfare are headed by legal immigrants”. Meanwhile, only 26 percent of immigrant households from Europe and 17 percent from South Asia received welfare in that period.

Education plays an important role in the story. Households headed by immigrants from Central America and Mexico (73 percent), the Caribbean (51 percent), and Africa (48 percent) have the highest overall welfare use.

If immigrants have high use rates, it is an indication that they are creating a significant burden on public coffers.

The types of welfare examined in the study included Medicaid as well as cash, food and housing programs.

Critics immediately attacked the report, but without much effect.

However, the report came under immediate criticism in some corners, with the libertarian Cato Institute's Alex Nowrasteh telling FoxNews.com "there's virtually nothing redeemable about this report". But the point of the study was to compare immigrants to natives, which is a critical question when formulating immigration policy. "We tolerate illegal immigration", he said in an interview. Rather than focus on the fact that immigrants are initially more dependent on welfare than the U.S.-born, she said they should focus on studies that show what happens to the children of those immigrants. "More specifically, what criteria for immigrant admission might be used when admitting immigrants if self-sufficiency is a policy goal", he continued. But how will they do it?

William Galston, a former domestic policy adviser to President Bill Clinton and now a government expert with the Brookings Institution, disputed the contention that immigrant reliance on federal social safety-net programs is blowing a huge hole in the federal budget and jeopardizing the government's fiscal security. Should the figure be reduced? "I don't know why that is", he said, floating the expansive immigrant networks in the US that provide assistance as possible causes and cultural differences. She said immigrants have larger households, making it more likely that one person in that household will receive some kind of welfare benefit.