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FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR RESETTLING REFUGEES

KENNETH BASCH*

INTRODUCTION

America is truly a country of immigrants. All Americans, except native American Indians, either came from abroad or descended from someone who did. Refugees are immigrants entering the United States in flight from persecution. They come from all parts of

* B.A., Tulane University, 1980; J.D., Washington University, 1983.


United States law holds numerous classifications for resident aliens. All aliens in the United States are classified either as immigrants or nonimmigrants. Immigrants are those aliens who intend to reside here permanently. They include persons desiring to reunite with their families, persons admitted into the country by reason of their special skills, and those permitted to remain for humanitarian reasons. See generally Portman, Immigration Benefits Based upon Family Relationships, St. Louis B.J., Summer 1981, at 36, 38.

Nonimmigrants are aliens temporarily residing or visiting the United States. These include business visitors and tourists, students and their families, temporary workers and their families, exchange visitors (e.g., visiting professors) and their families, company transferees, and crewmen. See id. Significant differences in the length of a permissible stay and eligibility for government benefit programs attach to the different entrant categories. See generally C. Gordon & H. Rosenfield, Immigration Law and Procedure §§ 2.1-2.54 (1981); A. Mutharika, The Alien Under American Law chs. IV, VIII, IX (1981).

2. American law defines a refugee as:

[A]ny person who is outside any country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, is outside any country in which such person last habitually resided, and who is unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country because of persecution or a well-founded
the world. Thus, assimilation into American society is rarely the same for any two groups. Generally, they require English instruction, vocational training, and often license recertification. The cost of fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion . . . .


The Immigration and Nationalization Service (INS) has not fully implemented this intention. For example, in south Florida recently there has been a large influx of Cubans and Haitians. In asylum hearings, Cubans enjoy a presumption of proof that they are fleeing persecution, hence, are refugees under the statutory definition. Haitians, on the other hand, have a full burden of proof in their asylum claims. Consequently, Cubans regularly receive refugee status while Haitians rarely do. See Caribbean Refugee Crisis: Cubans and Haitians, Hearings Before the Senate Judiciary Committee, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 16 (1980) (statement of Monsignor Bryan Walsh, Director of Catholic Charities, Archdiocese of Miami) [hereinafter cited as Senate Hearing, Caribbean Refugee Crisis]. See also Haitian Refugee Center v. Civiletti, 503 F. Supp. 442, 519-526 (S.D. Fla. 1980) (discussing treatment of Haitians during asylum hearings). Cf. Senate Hearing, Caribbean Refugee Crisis, supra, at 34 (statement of Charles B. Renfrew, U.S. Asst. Att'y Gen't that Cubans and Haitians are treated equally). As noted below, this treatment of Haitians has had a significant impact on the local governments in south Florida. See infra notes 20 & 23 and accompanying text.


4. See 126 CONG. REC. H1525 (daily ed. Mar. 4, 1980) (statement of Rep. Danielson that most recent Indochinese refugees have fewer skills and require longer periods of welfare assistance than earlier arrivals). See also Hearings on H.R. 2142 Before the Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and International Law, House Committee on the Judiciary, 97th Cong., 1st Sess. 5 (1981) (statement of Rep. Patterson that newer Indochinese refugees required more vocational and English instruction before becom-
for this assistance is immense.5

This Note focuses on who should bear these costs associated with refugee resettlement. Federalism issues arise because there are federal interests in refugee admissions6 and state and local government interests in providing government services, education, and public health.7 The Note first describes where refugees generally settle8 and the costs incurred by those communities.9 It then summarizes the refugee resettlement system,10 discussing the financial aid that the federal government provides to state and local governments.11 Finally, it argues that since refugee affairs are a national concern, the federal government should bear all of the resettlement costs.12

5. For fiscal year 1980 the estimated total cost of refugee services borne by the federal, state, and local governments was $1.7 billion. The estimate for 1981 is $2.1 billion. These figures include federal expenditures outside the United States to aid refugees who are overseas. The figures do not include funds provided by private individuals and foundations. See U.S. DEP’T OF STATE, REPORT TO CONGRESS—U.S. COSTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC REFUGEE ASSISTANCE BORNE BY THE FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS 4 (1980) [hereinafter cited as STATE DEP’T REPORT—REFUGEE ASSISTANCE COSTS], reprinted in U.S. Refugee Programs, Hearings Before the Senate Judiciary Committee, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 153 (1980).

6. See infra notes 81-95 and accompanying text.
7. See infra notes 30-77 and accompanying text.
8. See infra notes 13-29 and accompanying text.
9. See infra notes 30-77 and accompanying text.
10. See infra notes 78-128 and accompanying text.
11. See infra notes 129-79 and accompanying text.
12. See infra notes 180-303 and accompanying text. This Note covers refugee-
I. IMPACT ON URBAN AREAS

Today refugees primarily settle in urban areas.13 Part of the reason for this overwhelming urban settlement has been a fundamental change in United States refugee resettlement policies. In 1975, the stated goal of American refugee resettlement policy was to scatter refugees evenly throughout the country.14 Today, however, resettlement related problems and the responsibility of the federal government for these problems. It does not specifically cover the problems of undocumented aliens.

Undocumented aliens are foreigners who arrive in the United States without proper visas. Generally, they enter the country surreptitiously. The government can deport them for arriving without proper documents. See, e.g., Cavallaro v. Lehmann, 264 F.2d 237 (6th Cir. 1959) (deported alien stowaway); De Souza v. Barber, 263 F.2d 470 (9th Cir. 1959) (deported alien who reentered the country without a visa, after previous deportation); Grubisich v. Esperdy, 175 F. Supp. 445 (S.D.N.Y. 1959) (deported alien who had fraudulently obtained reentry permit). See also C. Gordon & H. Rosenfield, supra note 1, § 4.7k.

Undocumented aliens burden local communities in much the same way that refugees do. They are not eligible for government aid. See McAlvane & Siwulec, The Alien's Eligibility for Federal Benefit Programs, 12 CLEARINGHOUSE REV. 33 (1978). Thus, local communities frequently provide services for them without federal reimbursement. States and municipalities are unable to control the flow of undocumented aliens because the federal government controls entry at national borders. See infra note 123 and accompanying text. An analogous argument can be made, therefore, that the federal government is responsible for the welfare of undocumented aliens as well as for refugee resettlement costs. Accordingly, this Note makes extensive footnote references to the effects undocumented aliens have on local communities. For a summary of the government benefits to which undocumented aliens are entitled, see infra note 139.

13. Most refugees settle in cities (populations of 100,000 or more) or urban areas (populations of 2,500 to 99,999). In 1979, less than one percent of all entering immigrants stated an intention to settle in a rural area (areas with populations of less than 2,500). See SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 237 (Staff Report).

Even refugees with agricultural backgrounds tend to settle in urban areas. For example, in Iowa, Indochinese refugees from rural communities tended to move into urban centers, despite the expectations of Iowa officials that they would settle in Iowa's rural areas. The officials found that the agricultural skills the refugees developed in their home countries were too primitive to adapt to modern American agricultural techniques. 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 278 (statement of Kenneth Quinn, Foreign Service Officer assigned to Iowa Refugee Service Center).


14. In 1975, Congress believed that scattering refugees would avoid overburden-
policy recognizes the advantages of "clustering" refugees into communities. These advantages include reducing the culture shock refugees generally experience on arrival in the United States and allowing them to retain their native culture. This new policy also recognizes that refugees have a natural tendency to cluster together with their own, establishing their own communities.

Concentration of refugees in a few communities results in a disproportionate distribution of the costs of settlement. South Florida, for example, has been inundated with refugees from Cuba and Haiti.
As a result, Miami has the highest immigrant\textsuperscript{21} to resident ratio in the nation.\textsuperscript{22} The resettlement costs borne by the Miami community have been astronomical.\textsuperscript{23}
Orange County, California has also become a center for refugees. The influx of refugees there is primarily from Southeast Asia. Over 50,000 Indochinese have already settled in Orange County and over 1000 more arrive every month. The costs to Orange County relating to the refugee population are estimated at $3 million annually. Los Angeles County, California also has a growing Indochinese refugee population. Additionally, that county has a significant undocumented alien population, primarily from Mexico.

These examples illustrate the growing numbers of refugees and their concentration in urban areas across the country. As a result of


25. Id. at 4. The county has almost as many Indochinese refugees as the entire state of Texas. Texas, as a state, has the second largest Indochinese refugee population in the country. Id. at 32 (statement of Rep. Danielson). Texas had 37,000 Indochinese, Orange County had 29,000, and California as a whole had 160,000. Id.


28. Accurate statistics on the number of undocumented aliens in Los Angeles are unavailable. Little doubt exists, however, that Los Angeles is home for a significant number of illegal aliens. See SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 114 (app. H) (statement of Thomas Hibbard, Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County). Over half the kindergarten students in Los Angeles public schools speak Spanish as their native language. Hornblower, A Magnet for Millions, Wash. Post, July 4, 1980, at A1, col. 1. For a general explanation of undocumented aliens and this Note's coverage of them, see supra note 12.

29. In addition to the three examples, significant numbers of refugees live in New Jersey, see 126 CONG. REC. H1525 (daily ed. Mar. 4, 1980) (statement of Rep. Danielson); H.R. REP. NO. 1218, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 5, reprinted in 1980 U.S. CODE CONG. & AD. NEWS 3810, 3814; Oregon, see 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 377-78 (statement of Oregon Governor Victor Atiyeh); Senate Judiciary Hearing, supra note 1, at 164-65 (statement of Leo T. Hegstrom, Director, Oregon Department of Human Resources); Iowa, see 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 268-78 (statements of Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray and other Iowa officials), and other states. See generally SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 100 (app. H) (statement of Dr. Suzanne Dandry, Director, Arizona Department of Health Services); id. at 593 (statement of Mr. Minoru Yasui, Executive Director, Commission on Community Relations, City and County of Denver, Colorado; 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 294 (statement of Edwin B. Silverman, Director, Governor's Information Center for Asian Assistance, Illinois); id. at 280-82 (statement of Michigan Governor William G. Milliken); id. at 378-80 (statement of Minnesota Governor Albert H. Quie); id. at 291-92 (statement of Joseph
this concentration, local communities have had to increase public services, often at their own expense.

II. MAJOR COSTS TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES

A. Education

Public school enrollment in cities with refugee concentrations has soared.\(^{30}\) Added costs stem not only from higher enrollment, but also from the special costs necessary to educate refugee children.\(^{31}\) These special costs arise from the need for qualified bilingual instructors, special teaching materials, extra classroom space, extra buses, and more support services.\(^{32}\) The most recent arrivals have little formal schooling, and thus require remedial programs.\(^{33}\) Educational authorities estimate the additional costs for educating refugee children

---

H. Ryu, Coordinator, Indochinese Refugee Assistance Program, New York Department of Social Services; Senate Judiciary Hearings, supra note 1, at 160-63 (statement of Ms. Hellen B. O'Bannon, Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare); id. at 166-70 (statement of Comm'r Jerome Chapman, Texas Department of Human Resources); 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 290 (statement of Guy Lusk, Director, Division of Financial Services, Virginia Department of Welfare).

30. From April 1980 to August 1980, about 10,000 new Cuban refugee students entered the Dade County Public School System. That number is enough to fill completely 10 elementary schools. From November 1979 to August 1980, over 300 new Haitian students enrolled in Dade County schools. That figure is increasing by approximately 50 new Haitian students per month. In the Union City, New Jersey, Public School System, 1000 new students were expected—an increase of 13%. The state of Illinois expected 1720 new students for the 1980-1981 school year. H.R. REP. No. 1218, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 5-6, reprinted in 1980 U.S. CODE CONG. & AD. NEWS 3814-15.

At the same time, Indochinese student enrollment is also increasing. The influx of Indochinese refugees increased during the summer of 1980, and about 40% of the arriving refugees were school-age children. From 1977 until 1979 the number of Indochinese refugee children almost doubled. Id. See also Trouble in Paradise, supra note 20, at 22, 29.
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to be at least $1000 per child annually. These added costs usually continue for at least three years after a refugee child has arrived.

B. Health Care

Health costs also represent a significant burden on local communities. At one hospital in Miami, for example, a Haitian baby is born every six hours, each at local taxpayers' expense. Indochinese refugees receive medical examinations before leaving Asia for the United States. Nevertheless, they need extensive health care upon arrival. The living conditions in the Haitian community in Dade County, for example, are so poor that they pose a public health hazard to the community at large. Counties in California and Ari-

34. Estimated costs varied. The Dade County Public Schools estimated an additional cost of $1530 per refugee child for each child's first year in school. The additional costs for the second and third years would decrease to $719 per child. The Pennsylvania Department of Education estimated the additional costs of $3000 per student while the New Jersey Department of Education estimated additional costs of just $933 per child. All the education officials agreed, however, that they did not have enough money to cover these extra costs. Indeed, in view of conservative fiscal policies, the school districts were being taxed to their limits just to maintain their educational quality levels for regular nonrefugee students. H.R. REP. No. 1218, 96th Cong., 2d Sess., reprinted in 1980 U.S. CODE CONG. & AD. NEWS 3816.


37. The U.S. Public Health Service has found that: [T]he medical screening received in Asia by refugees has been incomplete, and the results inconsistently reported [and in some instances, deliberately misrepresented]; . . . refugees are known to have health problems, some of them transmissible. All are in agreement that tuberculosis is the most important public health problem presented by the refugees. U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, TEAM TO ASSESS THE HEALTH OF INDOCHINESE REFUGEES ON THE WEST COAST, REPORT TO THE SECRETARY, DEP'T OF H.E.W. (1979), quoted in Note, supra note 14, at 909.


39. Health conditions in the Haitian community are poor. The worst problem is malnutrition, though nearly as serious is the low level of vaccination against preventable diseases. Overcrowding and unsanitary facilities worsen these conditions. There is virtually no family planning and the birth rate is high because Haitians mistakenly believe that an American-born child will give them an advantage in their efforts to stay in the United States. Without improved medical conditions, the Haitian community presents a health hazard to the entire surrounding community. SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 59 (app. H) (statement of Dr. Robert E. Laurie, Deputy Director, Dade County Dept' of Health).
Refugees incur incidental health costs that also increase the financial burden. In addition to physicians, supplies, and facilities, refugees frequently require translator assistance during examinations. Many of the most recent refugee arrivals have had little exposure to modern medical care, so they also need special education and preventive health care programs.

C. Welfare

Authorities disagree about the number of refugees on welfare. Es-

40. In Los Angeles, the county government has paid many outstanding bills for undocumented Mexicans. Estimates of the future cost to the county run as high as $100 million. This money will come from the county property tax. The county will receive no reimbursements from either the City or the State for these expenses. Id. at 114 (statement of Thomas Hibbard, Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County).

Another problem in Los Angeles is a private hospital practice known as "patient dumping." Private hospitals and facilities turn away undocumented alien patients because they have no funds to pay for medical services. The private facilities transfer the patients to public facilities. In 1979 alone, 21,000 of these patients were transferred to Los Angeles County Hospitals. Dallek, Health Care for Undocumented Immigrants: A Story of Neglect, 14 CLEARINGHOUSE REV. 407, 408-09 (1980). See also County Health Alliance v. Board of Supers., No. C. 360546, slip op. (Cal. Super. Ct., Los Angeles County, June 24, 1981) (enjoining Los Angeles County from requiring indigent undocumented aliens from providing information to the INS regarding their immigration status as a condition to receiving medical care), reported in 15 CLEARINGHOUSE REV. 496 (1981).

41. The Arizona Department of Health Services estimates that health care for undocumented Mexicans in Arizona costs the State $3.5 million annually. Undocumented aliens are rarely able to pay for the expenses themselves and the federal and state governments refuse to share the costs with impacted local communities. SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 100 (app. H) (statement of Dr. Suzanne Dandoy, Arizona Dep't of Health Services). An Arizona hospital recently asked the federal government to assume its management because it had lost a substantial amount of money providing services to undocumented Mexicans who were unable to pay for the services. Id. (statement of Dr. Charles E. Cable, Administrator, Cochise County Hospital in Arizona).


44. SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 59 (app. H) (statement of Dr. Robert E. Laurie, Deputy Director, Dade County Dep't of Public Health, that Haitian arrivals have little health care or knowledge of health care).
timates of the percentage of Indochinese refugees receiving welfare range from thirty-six percent\textsuperscript{45} to ninety percent.\textsuperscript{46}

Most officials, however, agree that the number of newer arrivals applying for welfare is increasing.\textsuperscript{47} There are four main reasons for this increase. First, voluntary agencies\textsuperscript{48} that resettle refugees now commonly register incoming refugees for welfare benefits immediately after their arrival\textsuperscript{49} because processing takes four to six weeks.\textsuperscript{50} Thus, refugees unable to find work during their first month will still have some secured income.\textsuperscript{51} Once they begin to receive cash benefits, however, they are less likely to accept entry-level jobs paying little more than welfare.\textsuperscript{52}

Second, refugees arriving today have fewer transferable skills and less education than earlier arrivals.\textsuperscript{53} Consequently, they require
longer periods for English instruction and vocational training.\textsuperscript{54} Also, believing that the government provides welfare to enable them to attend English and vocational classes, many refugees remain in classes for extended periods, hoping to locate better jobs when they finally look for work.\textsuperscript{55}

Third, refugees who find work usually begin in low-paying, entry-level positions.\textsuperscript{56} Many must apply for welfare to supplement these incomes.\textsuperscript{57} This is especially common among the Indochinese refugees, who often arrive in large families with many dependents.\textsuperscript{58}

Fourth, medical benefits are often linked to welfare assistance. Therefore, many refugees stay on welfare beyond their period of actual need in order to retain medical benefits.\textsuperscript{59} Although the reasons refugees seek welfare may vary, the effect is constant. Refugees on welfare indubitably burden the finances of state and local governments.\textsuperscript{60} In 1981, state and local governments spent approximately $35 to $55 million in 1981 and $70 to $110 million in state and local governments spent approximately $35 to $55 million in 1981 and $70 to $110 million in

\textsuperscript{54} See supra note 53. For many refugees, English instruction here is their first exposure to formal education. 1981 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2142, supra note 4, at 7 (statement of Rep. Vento that the Hmong (a group of Indochinese) refugees in Minnesota were mostly illiterate in their own language, which is so primitive that it only developed an alphabet a few years ago).

\textsuperscript{55} See SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 241 (app. C) (statement of Wells Klein, Executive Director, American Council for Nationality Service, that the current structure of English and vocational training discourages refugees from looking for work immediately after arrival); Shearer, Refugee Resettlement: Not Why, But How, in SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 273-76 (app. C) (arguing that the current resettlement system misleads refugees on the role of welfare payments). See also Morin, Troubled Refugees, Wall St. J., Feb. 16, 1983, at 1, col 1.

\textsuperscript{56} 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 275 (statement of Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray).

\textsuperscript{57} Id. at 294 (statement of Edwin B. Silverman, Director, Governor's Information Center for Asian Assistance in Illinois).

\textsuperscript{58} Id.

\textsuperscript{59} See SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 190 (Final Report and Recommendations).

\textsuperscript{60} A Reagan Administration spokesman estimated that prolonging federal reimbursement to state and local governments for the costs of refugees on welfare would cost the federal government $35 to $55 million in 1981 and $70 to $110 million in
$106.5 million for cash and medical benefits for refugees.\textsuperscript{61} The length of time refugees generally spend on welfare is also disputed. One federal study found that, on average, refugees spend nine months on welfare.\textsuperscript{62} A survey in Los Angeles County indicated, however, that the length of time ranges from twenty-five to forty-three months.\textsuperscript{63}

This time period is important in determining where the financial burden falls. Current federal legislation authorizes the federal government to reimburse state and local governments for all their expenditures on refugee welfare payments for the first three years a refugee is in the United States.\textsuperscript{64} Also, the federal government pays more than half of the costs for all welfare programs, whether or not they involve refugees.\textsuperscript{65} Therefore, after the three-year total reimbursement period, the federal government still pays more than half the welfare costs for refugees.\textsuperscript{66} Many urban officials, however, believe that this three-year total reimbursement period is insufficient.\textsuperscript{67}

D. Other Costs

Many of the costs local communities incur are not measurable in

\textsuperscript{61} STATE DEP’T REPORT—REFUGEE ASSISTANCE COSTS, supra note 5, at 156.
\textsuperscript{62} See SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 242 (app. C) (statement of Wells Klein, Executive Director, American Council for Nationality Service, citing a study conducted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare).
\textsuperscript{63} The survey showed that primary refugees spent an average of 25 months on welfare while secondary refugees (see supra note 18) spent an average of 43 months on welfare. 126 CONG. REC. H1525 (daily ed. Mar. 4, 1980) (statement of Rep. Danielson). See also SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 188 (Final Report and Recommendations) (finding that a significant number of refugees require welfare assistance for more than 36 months).
\textsuperscript{66} M. OZAWA, supra note 65, at 17.
\textsuperscript{67} See infra note 151.
financial terms, but are sociological in nature. Nevertheless, they are a significant addition to the major costs of education, health care, and welfare payments. 68

Refugees may be responsible for as much as half of the violent crimes in Miami, which now has the country's highest murder rate. 69 Furthermore, refugees have clashed with other minority groups. 70 Resentment arises because domestic minorities often believe that refugees receive more benefits than the domestic poor. 71 Therefore, there have been scattered outbreaks of violence between refugees and these other minority groups. 72

Additionally, refugee concentrations adversely affect unemployment rates 73 in labor markets, overburdened before they arrived. 74 In these same communities, low-cost public housing shortages have also resulted from refugee concentrations. 75 Miami, for example, has not had any new public housing projects for over twenty years, 76 so some refugees there still live in tents underneath highways. 77

III. THE REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT SYSTEM

State and local governments have little control over the number of

68. See supra notes 30-63 and accompanying text.
69. See Trouble in Paradise, supra note 20, at 23.
71. See Slonim, Freedom Flotilla from Cuba: Will the Harbor Stay Open?, 66 A.B.A. J. 823, 824 (1980). Doris Meissner, Deputy Associate Attorney General, noted that after the 1980 Cuban influx the political atmosphere was far from ideal for accepting the new refugees. Id. at 824. See also Peirce, Refugees and Cities: A Multi-Pronged Dilemma, in SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 267 (app. C).
72. See, e.g., Chaze, Refugees: Stung by a Backlash, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP., Oct. 13, 1980, at 60, reprinted in G. McCLELLAN, supra note 13, at 49 (describing a rock-throwing incident between Chicanos and Indochinese refugees); Scanlan, supra note 3, at 622-23 n.50 (noting tensions between Cubans and the local communities where they have settled and between Indochinese and Hispanics in Los Angeles).
73. In Miami, the unemployment rate rose from 5.7% to an estimated 13% as a result of the 1980 Cuban-Haitian influx. See Trouble in Paradise, supra note 20, at 29.
74. See North & Martin, supra note 13.
77. See Trouble in Paradise, supra note 20, at 22.
refugees settling in their communities. Three basic reasons explain this. First, the federal government has absolute plenary power over refugee admissions. Therefore, state and local governments are preempted from acting. Second, the bureaucratic system for settling refugees in the United States does not provide for state or local government input. Third, geography and prior resettlement patterns affect where refugees settle.

A. Federal Government's Plenary Power Over Refugee Admissions

The Constitution expressly grants to Congress the power to regulate immigration. The Supreme Court has consistently interpreted this power as absolute. In the Chinese Exclusion Case, the Court held that control over immigration was an incident of sovereignty. As sovereign, the federal government has the power to establish national policies concerning immigration.

In Kleindienst v. Mandel, the Court again recognized this absolute power holding that Congress can bar or condition an alien's entry for any reason it sees fit. The Court stated that since control over immigration is peculiarly political, the judiciary generally should defer to Congress on matters concerning immigration.

More recently, in Fiallo v. Bell, the Court refused to review congressional decisions regarding alien admissions. At issue was the

78. U.S. Const. art. I, § 8. See infra note 81. See also infra notes 82-95 and accompanying text.
79. See infra notes 96-121 and accompanying text.
80. See infra notes 122-25 and accompanying text.
81. U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 4, states in part: "The Congress shall have the power. . . [t]o establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization."
83. 130 U.S. 581 (1889).
84. Id. at 606-07.
85. Id. See also Shaughnessy v. Mezei, 345 U.S. 206 (1953) (Congress could hold an excluded alien indefinitely without a hearing); Oceanic Steam Navigation Co. v. Stranahan, 214 U.S. 320 (1908) (Congress could prohibit persons from bringing in aliens with contagious diseases).
86. 408 U.S. 753 (1972).
87. Id. at 765-66. See also cases cited id. at 766 n.6.
88. Id. at 766.
89. Id. at 766-67.
constitutionality of a section of the Immigration and Nationality Act\(^9\) that granted special immigration status to children who sought entry by virtue of their relationship to their mothers. The Act denied a similar preference status to illegitimate children who sought entry through their natural fathers.\(^9\) Despite the implications on due process and equal protection, the Court upheld the statute, finding that Congress' power to control immigration is subject to an extremely narrow standard of judicial review.\(^9\)

These cases illustrate Congress' absolute power over immigration. States and local communities, therefore, cannot interfere with the flow of refugees from abroad, even if they have the available means.\(^9\) Once a refugee arrives in the United States, however, it is unclear what power Congress has to regulate his or her resettlement.\(^9\)

**B. The System For Refugee Resettlement**

1. Government Agencies

As many as nine government agencies may take part in one refugee's journey from his or her native country to the United States.\(^9\)

---

92. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(b)(1)(D) (1976) defines “child” as an “unmarried person under twenty-one . . . who is . . . an illegitimate child . . . through whom . . . benefit is sought by virtue of the relationship of the child to its natural mother.” *Id.*
93. 430 U.S. at 796.
94. *See also* Nyquist v. Mauclet, 432 U.S. 1, 10 (1977) (“Control over immigration and naturalization is entrusted exclusively to the Federal Government, and a State has no power to interfere.”) (dictum); DeCanas v. Bica, 424 U.S. 351, 354 (1976) (“Power to regulate immigration is unquestionably exclusively a federal power.”) (dictum); Oceanic Navigation Co. v. Stranahan, 214 U.S. 320, 339 (1909) (“over no conceivable subject is the legislative power of Congress more complete than it is over [immigration]”); Haitian Refugee Center v. Civiletti, 503 F. Supp. 442, 452 (S.D. Fla. 1980).
96. In addition to the four agencies described in the text, others play minor roles in resettling refugees. The Agriculture Department administers the food stamp program and the School Lunch and Breakfast Program. In 1980, Agriculture Department expenditures for refugees totaled $126 million, and was expected to cost $211.6 million in 1981. *State Dep't Report—Refugee Assistance Costs, supra* note 5, at 168. The Commerce Department administers the National Sea Grant Program (for
Four of those agencies, however, play the major roles in admission and resettlement.

The State Department is responsible for major policy formulation and American cooperation with international refugee organizations. It also houses refugees who are still abroad. For the years 1975 to 1979, State Department appropriations for refugees exceeded $500 million.

The Justice Department participates primarily in admissions. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), a subdepartment of the Justice Department, screens refugees who apply for admission while abroad. It also conducts hearings for refugees who seek asylum after arrival in the United States.

The Department of Health and Human Services administers the various welfare and special assistance programs for which refugees (commercial fishermen) and the Minority Business Development Administration. The cost attributable to refugees from these two programs was approximately $600,000 for both 1980 and 1981. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) manages Public Housing and Section 8 Housing. HUD estimates that 5500 refugee families were living in such developments in 1980 and that an additional 5000 families would move into such housing in 1981. The costs were $12.2 million for 1980 and an expected $27.6 million for 1981. The Labor Department participates in refugee resettlement through its Job Corps, Comprehensive Employment and Training, and Federal-State Employee Service programs. Relative to refugee eligibility, participation has been low. Nevertheless, refugee costs for these programs cumulatively totaled about $106 million for 1980 and 1981 combined. Finally, the Defense Department assists the State Department in housing and transporting refugees while they are still abroad. See Note, supra note 14, at 888 n.73.

97. The Department of State oversees the Interagency Committee on Refugee Affairs, which replaced the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs and is responsible for formulating and implementing refugee policy as well as working with international organizations. STAFF OF SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, 96TH CONG., 1ST Sess., U.S. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAMS AND POLICIES 15-17 (Comm. Print 1979) [hereinafter cited as SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PRINT].


103. See infra notes 139-43 and accompanying text.

104. See infra notes 146-51 and accompanying text.
Refugees are eligible. To coordinate the various Health and Human Services programs in which refugees participate, the Department now has an Office of Refugee Resettlement.105 The Department also provides medical examinations to refugees before they enter the United States.106

Finally, the Department of Education plays a vital role in resettlement. It implements the Refugee Educational Assistance Act of 1980, which provides funds for general assistance and special instruction to affected educational districts.107

The system of refugee resettlement in the United States relies heavily on the assistance of various voluntary agencies (VOLAG's).108 Although VOLAG's are usually private, nonprofit organizations,109 one state has an official agency that is a VOLAG.110

VOLAG's aid the INS and the State Department overseas by helping to identify eligible refugees.111 Agency representatives then send reports on incoming refugees to the American Council of Voluntary Agencies,112 which meets twice a week in New York.113 At the meetings, the Council matches incoming refugees to individual VOLAG's.114

---

106. See State Dep't Report—Refugee Assistance Costs, supra note 5, at 167.
107. See infra notes 161-63 and accompanying text.
108. See Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra note 97, at 17.
109. Id. at 18. VOLAG's are often affiliated with religious organizations, e.g., Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, Church World Service, U.S. Catholic Conference, Council of Jewish Federations. U.S. Refugee Programs, Hearings Before the Senate Judiciary Committee, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. (1980); or ethnic groups, e.g., American Foundation for Czechoslovakian Refugees, Hebrew Immigration Aid Society. Id.
110. Iowa has its own state agency, the Iowa Refugee Service Center, as a VOLAG. 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 274 (statement of Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray).
111. See Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra note 97, at 18.
114. Id. See also Note, supra note 14, at 889. Generally the Council will assign incoming refugees who have relatives in the United States to the same VOLAG that resettled their relatives. Shearer, Refugee Resettlement: Not Why, But How, in Select Commission Report, supra note 3, at 274 (app. C).
After receiving data on the individual refugees assigned to them, VOLAG's locate a sponsor, usually an individual, single family, or a group. The VOLAG and the sponsor then arrange for a variety of services, such as English language training, school registration, housing, cash and medical assistance, and employment counseling. Although these individual sponsors are under no legal obligation to fulfill the responsibilities that they undertake, they usually honor them as moral obligations.

VOLAG's, frequently understaffed, rely heavily on volunteers. The State Department provides limited funds to help finance these programs. A VOLAG contracts with the State Department to pro-

115. See Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra note 97, at 18.
116. Id.; Note, supra note 14, at 890. Not all VOLAG's provide the same services, however. Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra note 97, at 18. For example, the Iowa Refugee Service Center does not agree to accept a refugee until it has arranged for a sponsor, housing, and a job. Consequently, the number of refugees on welfare in Iowa has been far below the national average, and the number of refugees moving from Iowa after being settled there is equally low. Many VOLAG's do not make these arrangements in advance, resulting in higher welfare costs. 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 273-74 (statement of Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray); Shearer, Refugee Resettlement: Not Why, But How, in Select Commission Report, supra note 3, at 274 (app. C). Although Iowa's success has been formidable, it is not necessarily an example other refugee-impacted areas could duplicate. First, Iowa has more control over refugee admissions because its state agency is a VOLAG. Thus, the Iowa government decides how many refugees Iowa will resettle. In contrast, other areas rarely receive notice when their local VOLAG's agree to accept new refugees. The state and local governments, therefore, know neither when nor how many refugees will arrive in any given time period. They usually do not discover how many refugees have arrived until the refugees apply for welfare. See Select Commission Report, supra note 3, at 593 (app. H) (statement of Minoru Yasui, Executive Director, Commission on Community Relations, City and County of Denver); Peirce, Refugees: A Multi-Pronged Dilemma, in Select Commission Report, supra note 3, at 267-70 (app. C).

The second advantage Iowa enjoys that other areas lack is favorable geography. Considering Iowa's central location and its distance from refugee sources, it is highly unlikely that Iowa will ever experience a major demographic movement. South Florida, on the other hand, finds itself inundated with refugees because of its location. Texas and California have large undocumented alien populations, partially due to geography. See infra note 122 and accompanying text.

117. Note, supra note 14 at 890. The Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, however, has advocated improvement of the sponsor selection process to ensure responsible sponsors. Select Commission Report, supra note 3, at 193 (Final Report and Recommendations).


119. Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra note 97, at 18-19.
vide certain resettlement assistance in exchange for an amount of money determined on a per capita basis.\textsuperscript{120} The State Department funds do not cover all of the VOLAG's expenses, however.\textsuperscript{121}

C. The Effect of Geography on Refugee Resettlement

Geography is a major factor in determining refugee resettlement. This is particularly true in areas that are physically proximate to the refugee source.\textsuperscript{122} The entry states are dependent on the federal government to protect their borders from clandestine, illegal entry.\textsuperscript{123}

A related geographical factor is the tendency for refugees to settle within established communities of people from their homelands, regardless of the economic opportunities in the area.\textsuperscript{124} In California, for example, as many as one-half of the Indochinese arriving every month come from other parts of the United States, where VOLAG's originally resettled them.\textsuperscript{125}

D. Consequences of the Refugee Resettlement System

The cumulative consequence of these factors is that a few communities disproportionately bear the burden of absorbing the majority of entering refugees. These communities have virtually no control over the refugee influx. Local officials, accordingly, experience difficulty in planning necessary programs.\textsuperscript{126} Many officials complain that

\textsuperscript{120} In 1979, the amount was $250 per refugee and $350 per Indochinese refugee. \textit{Id.} In 1980, the amount per refugee was $300. In the midst of the Cuban refugee crisis, however, the federal government began offering $2000 to sponsors willing to resettle the new arrivals. \textit{N.Y. Times, Sept. 26, 1980, at 34, col. 1.}

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PRINT, supra note 97, at 18-19.}

\textsuperscript{122} South Florida has numerous Cuban and Haitian refugees as a result of the "Freedom Flotilla." \textit{See supra note 20.} The primary source of Texas' undocumented alien population is Mexico.

\textsuperscript{123} Telephone interview with Martha Allen, Texas Attorney General's Office (Jan. 17, 1983). \textit{See also Plyler v. Doe, 102 S. Ct. 2382, 2398-99 (1982) (stating that the federal "naturalization" power, coupled with plenary federal authority over foreign relations and international commerce, gives the federal government exclusive authority for admission of aliens to the United States).}

\textsuperscript{124} \textit{See supra note 18.}


\textsuperscript{126} \textit{See SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 593 (app. H) (statement of Minoru Yasui, Executive Director, Commission on Community Relations, City and County of Denver).}
they receive inadequate, if any, forewarning before refugees arrive.\textsuperscript{127} As a result, local refugees programs are often inadequate.\textsuperscript{128}

**IV. Aid Covered by the Federal Government**

**A. Current Federal Programs**

The federal government has actively supported refugee assistance programs for over thirty years.\textsuperscript{129} The Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962\textsuperscript{130} authorized federal funds for continuous financial assistance to refugees.\textsuperscript{131} The Act also provided funds for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.\textsuperscript{132} Congress has initiated various refugee programs benefiting specific groups under the budget authorizations of the 1962 Act.\textsuperscript{133}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{127} See Senate Judiciary Hearing, supra note 1, at 165 (complaint of Leo T. Hegstrom, Director, Oregon Department of Human Resources, that the federal government failed to warn Oregon of incoming refugees, and "[a]s a result, staff and program accommodations were rushed, compromising both their responsiveness and their effectiveness").
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{128} Id.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{129} Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra note 97, at 5.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{130} Pub. L. No. 87-510, 76 Stat. 121 (1962).
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{131} Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra note 97, at 38.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{132} Id. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was established in 1951 to coordinate international refugee programs and seek solutions to world refugee crises. The UNHCR interviews all refugees in refugee camps and determines where each refugee wants to settle. It then relays this information to the appropriate government agencies of the desired country of settlement (the INS in the case of the United States). See United States Committee for Refugees, 1980 World Refugee Survey, reprinted in U.S. Refugee Programs, Hearing Before the Senate Judiciary Committee, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 355-59 (1980). The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) transports refugees from refugee camps to their new home countries. Founded in 1952, ICEM has moved 1.6 million refugees. Despite the word "European" in its name, it is an international organization with worldwide participation. See id. at 385. See also Note, supra note 14 at 889 n.76.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{133} For example, after the 1962 Act, the Cuban Refugee Program, founded with Presidential contingency funds, began to receive appropriations from Congress. The program provided financial assistance, educational services, employment counseling and training, and transportation assistance to locations of resettlement. By June, 1976, 465,000 of approximately 665,000 Cuban refugees had taken advantage of the program, which is based in the Cuban Refugee Emergency Center in Miami. The program's long duration was a subject of much debate. It is gradually being phased out. See Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra note 97, at 38-39. See also S. Rep. No. 256, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. 8, reprinted in 1980 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad.
Congress promulgated the Refugee Act of 1980\(^{134}\) to eliminate an unpredictable ad hoc system for admitting\(^{135}\) and resettling refugees.\(^{136}\) The Act established the Office of Refugee Resettlement within the Department of Health and Human Services to execute the federal government’s role in refugee resettlement.\(^{137}\) The Director of the Office has the authority to provide funds to public and private agencies resettling refugees.\(^{138}\)

Under the Act, refugees\(^{139}\) are eligible for Aid to Families with

News 141, 152 (stating that current refugee assistance programs set durational limits to avoid the perpetual tendency of the Cuban Program).

The Indochinese Refugee Program, established in 1975, also received funds through the 1962 Act. The funds were used for evacuation, temporary housing prior to entering the United States, and resettlement after arrival. Again, the primary services provided were educational programs (both language and vocational), and cash, medical, and social assistance. See Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra note 97, at 40-41. There have also been appropriations under the 1962 Act to aid Soviet and other refugees. Id. at 42.


135. The procedure of refugee admissions is, in itself, a broad subject beyond the scope of this Note. See generally C. Gordon & H. Rosenfield, supra note 1, § 2.24A; Scanlan, supra note 3; Note, supra note 102.


138. Id.

139. Undocumented aliens living in American communities receive very few of these benefits. Undocumented aliens are eligible for insurance-based benefits such as Workers’ Compensation and Disability and Retirement Insurance, but they are generally not eligible for public assistance benefits such as welfare, food stamps, and Medicaid. See 45 C.F.R. § 233.50 (1981); A. Mutharika, supra note 1, ch. IV at 77; McAlvana & Siwulec, supra note 12.

Federal benefit programs are limited to United States citizens, permanent resident aliens, or aliens “otherwise permanently residing in the United States under color of law.” 45 C.F.R. § 233.50 (1981). Although a plain meaning interpretation of the regulation tends to exclude undocumented aliens from federal program benefits, the language has been broadly interpreted. In Holley v. Lavine, 553 F.2d 845 (2d Cir. 1977), cert. denied, 435 U.S. 947 (1978), the Second Circuit held that “permanently residing under color of law” includes undocumented aliens who have legally entered the country but have illegally remained. These people are entitled to AFDC benefits if the INS is not contemplating deportation. 553 F.2d at 850-51.

Thus, undocumented aliens may be eligible for a variety of federal benefit programs. Nonetheless, the burden they place upon local communities is similar to the burden caused by refugee resettlement. See supra notes 12, 40 & 41.

Unemployment compensation is limited to aliens “lawfully admitted for permanent residence . . . or otherwise permanently residing in the United States under color of law.” 26 U.S.C. § 3304(a)(14)(A) (1976). Courts tend to interpret this language nar-
Dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and food stamps. State agencies administering these programs pay refugees as they would pay any citizen. The federal government then reimburses the states for their entire expense, including reasonable administrative fees.

The Act also authorizes funds for initial resettlement, vocational training, English instruction, child welfare, and cash and medical assistance. Furthermore, it limits federal reimbursement for cash and medical assistance in the first three years after a refugee.
Refugee children are unquestionably entitled to free public education. The Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 provides

151. *Id.* New Department of Health and Human Services regulations provide that the federal government will reimburse states for all of the assistance provided to refugees through the AFDC, adult assistance, Medicaid, and SSI programs, for the first 36 months each eligible refugee spends in the United States. Refugees who do not meet all the AFDC, SSI, or adult assistance program requirements, but meet the AFDC need standard for their state of residence, are eligible for "refugee cash assistance," a special program. Similarly, refugees ineligible for Medicaid, but meeting the requisites of individual states' medically needy programs, or meeting the requisites of individual states' AFDC programs (for states that do not have medically needy programs), are eligible for "refugee medical assistance," also a special program. Federal reimbursement for state contributions to the refugee cash assistance and refugee medical assistance programs is limited to the first 18 months after a refugee has arrived in the United States. If a state or local government has a program for all its citizens that uses state and/or local funds exclusively, then the federal government will reimburse the state or local government for all assistance provided to refugees for their second 18 months in the United States. 47 Fed. Reg. 10,849 (1982) (to be codified at 45 C.F.R. § 400.62).

Originally, the Refugee Act of 1980 limited the time for reimbursement to two years. The Carter Administration supported a two-year limit because it believed this would provide incentives to states to assimilate refugees as quickly as possible and would be fairer to citizens not eligible for the special refugee benefits. See 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 234-35 (statement of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Joseph A. Califano). Congress extended the period to three years after considerable testimony opposing the two-year limit. See, e.g., *id.* at 271-72 (statement of Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray that two years is insufficient); *id.* at 378 (letter of Oregon Governor Victor Atiyeh to the House Subcommittee stating that two years is insufficient); *id.* at 379 (recommendation of Minnesota Governor Albert H. Quie for minimum three-year reimbursement period); *id.* at 281 (statement of Michigan Governor William G. Milliken that two years, or any across-the-board limit, is inappropriate); *id.* at 292 (recommendation of Joseph H. Ryu, Coordinator, Indochinese Refugee Assistance Program, New York Department of Social Services, that the reimbursement period last three to five years); *id.* at 288 (statement of Kyle S. McKinsey, Deputy Director, California Department of Social Services, that differences in background of refugees made any across-the-board time limit inappropriate); 1981 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2142, *supra* note 4, at 77-78 (statements of Harvey Ruvin, Dade County Commission; Robert J. Orth, Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Ramsey County, Minnesota; Bruce Nesteande, Orange County, California Supervisor; and Eddy S. Tanaka, Los Angeles County, California Department of Public Services, that there are no hard, reliable statistics on how long it takes for refugees to achieve self-sufficiency).

The Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy has recommended an extension of the three-year limitation in certain circumstances. See Select Commission Report, *supra* note 3, at 188 (Final Report and Recommendations).

grants to the state and local educational agencies, and provides assistance to such agencies for adult refugee programs. Congress originally promulgated the Act to deal with the immense impact caused by the huge influx of Cubans and Haitians in 1980, and the recent Indochinese arrivals. Congress broadened the Act in late 1981, however, to cover all refugees.

The Education Act authorizes funds through three basic programs. First, Title II provides funds for general assistance to local school districts. Title III then covers supplementary educational programs such as English instruction, special materials, and specially trained instructors. Finally, Title III also authorizes funds for adult education programs.

155. Id. § 401, 94 Stat. at 1807.
Although the Refugee Education Assistance Act provides much needed relief to state and local education agencies, it fails to cover the total cost of educating new refugee children. Some state and local education agencies estimate that costs will exceed $1500 per student for the first year each student enrolls in school. The maximum amount authorized under the Act, however, is $1100 per student for the first year. Authorized funds for the second and third years decrease considerably.

In response to the unexpected mass immigration of over 100,000 Cubans in the spring and summer of 1980, President Carter did not exercise the emergency provisions of the Refugee Act of 1980. Instead, the President conferred on the new arrivals the distinct status of "Cuban-Haitian Entrant." This status created a great deal of confusion concerning the Entrants' eligibility for government aid. Because the Entrants were not refugees, they were initially ineligible for benefits under the Refugee Act of 1980. In October, 1980,

---


164. The estimates vary. Dade County expects additional costs for refugee students to be $1530 per student for the student's first year in school, and $719 per child in each of the next two years. Pennsylvania expects the added cost to run $3000 more per student, while New Jersey estimates that $933 per child extra will be sufficient. See H.R. REP. No. 1218, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 7, reprinted in 1980 U.S. CODE CONG. & AD. NEWS 3810, 3816.

165. This represents $400 from Title II and $700 from Title III. See supra notes 162-163.

166. See supra notes 161-162.

167. See supra note 20.

168. See supra notes 134-38 & 140-51 and accompanying text.

169. Congress did not unanimously support the President's action. Senator Kennedy, for example, believed that the President should have admitted the 1980 Cuban refugees under the Emergency Provisions of the Refugee Act of 1980. See Letter from Senator Kennedy to President Carter (May 20, 1980), reprinted in 126 CONG. REC. S6436-37 (daily ed. June 6, 1980). Cf., Hearings on Refugee Admissions and Resettlement Programs—Fiscal Year 1981 Before the House Committee on the Judiciary, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 177 (1980) (State Department statement that the Refugee Act's provision were not intended for, and were too cumbersome to use in, the circumstances of a mass, uncontrolled, direct exodus to the United States). For a general discussion of the special status, see supra note 20.

170. See supra note 20.

171. See Scanlan, supra note 3, at 622-23. See also Bach, supra note 23; Wright, The Development of Refugee Policy, NATION'S CITIES WEEKLY, Aug. 11, 1980, at 3, reprinted in G. McCLELLAN, supra note 13, at 20, 24. For a summary of the benefits refugees generally receive, see supra notes 129-66 and accompanying text.
however, Congress authorized the President to provide the Entrants with refugee benefits.\textsuperscript{172} This action freed $100 million in appropriated funds for cash, medical, social and educational assistance.\textsuperscript{173}

B. \textit{The Reagan Administration Proposal—The Omnibus Immigration Control Act}

In October, 1981, Senator Strom Thurmond introduced the Omnibus Immigration Control Act\textsuperscript{174} on behalf of the Reagan Administration.\textsuperscript{175} Title III of the Act, the Cuban-Haitian Temporary Resident Status Act of 1981,\textsuperscript{176} proposes to exclude Cuban-Haitian Entrants from all federal benefit programs for which they are currently eligible.\textsuperscript{177} The proposal also gives the Attorney General discretion to grant work permits.\textsuperscript{178} The Act presents the danger that some Entrants may not receive work authorization while also being ineligible for federal benefit programs. Thus, the potential cost to state and local governments,\textsuperscript{179} and the direct effect on the Entrants them-
selves, is enormous.

V. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD FULLY BEAR THE COSTS OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

A. The Tenth Amendment

1. Developments Until 1976

The tenth amendment is the constitutional source for "federalism," a term used to indicate the dual sovereignty of American government. Essentially, the tenth amendment invests in the states all the powers of sovereignty that the constitution does not delegate to the federal government. Throughout American history the scope of the tenth amendment limitation on federal power has varied.

The Supreme Court threatened the strength of the tenth amendment in United States v. Darby. At issue was the constitutionality of the Fair Labor Standards Act, in which Congress attempted to mandate a national minimum wage. The Court upheld the statute as a valid exercise of the commerce power, and interpreted the tenth amendment to be "but a truism that all is retained which has not been surrendered."

In Maryland v. Wirtz, the tenth amendment reached its weakest
point. The Fair Labor Standards Act, again at issue, had originally excluded states from its provisions.\footnote{188} By amendments in 1961\footnote{189} and 1966,\footnote{190} however, Congress expanded the definition of "employer" to include the states. Maryland and twenty-seven other states challenged this extension of the Act's coverage.\footnote{191} The Court upheld the amended Act, refusing to exempt state-run schools and hospitals from the minimum wage provisions. The Court noted that these institutions could potentially handle a wide variety of goods in commerce.\footnote{192}

2. National League of Cities and Hodel

In 1976,\footnote{193} the Court revitalized the tenth amendment in \textit{National League of Cities v. Usery}.\footnote{194} There, the Supreme Court struck down a congressional attempt to extend the Fair Labor Standards Act to state and municipal governments.\footnote{195} A four-vote plurality held that Congress could not disturb the states in areas of "integral governmental functions."\footnote{196} Although the Court did not precisely define "integral governmental function,"\footnote{197} it cited, as illustrative,\footnote{198} \textit{Coyle v. Smith}.\footnote{199} \textit{Coyle} held that Congress could not compel a territory to

\footnote{188}{Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, Pub. L. No. 75-718, § 3(d), 52 Stat. 1060. The Act defined "employer" to exclude ". . . the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State. . . ." \textit{Id}.}
\footnote{189}{29 U.S.C. § 206 (Supp. II 1964).}
\footnote{191}{392 U.S. at 187.}
\footnote{192}{\textit{Id}. at 201.}
\footnote{193}{The Court had initially signaled a retreat from the extreme view of \textit{Wirtz} in \textit{Fry v. United States}, 421 U.S. 542 (1975) (the tenth amendment does limit the power of Congress over States, though not over private parties).}
\footnote{194}{426 U.S. 833 (1976).}
\footnote{196}{426 U.S. at 851.}
\footnote{197}{In the \textit{National League} plurality opinion, "integral governmental function" went by at least four different names. The opinion referred to "functions essential to separate and independent existence," \textit{Id}. at 845; "essential governmental decisions," \textit{Id}. at 850; "integral governmental functions," \textit{Id}. at 851; and "traditional governmental functions," \textit{Id}. at 852.}
\footnote{198}{\textit{Id}. at 845.}
\footnote{199}{221 U.S. 559 (1911).}
move its capital as a prerequisite to statehood. Moreover, the plurality provided an exemplary list of government functions that were within its definition of "integral governmental function": fire prevention; police protection; sanitation; public health; and parks and recreation. Significantly, Justice Blackmun, concurring, agreed with what he described as the plurality's "balancing approach." The plurality opinion, however, made no mention of a balancing approach. As a result, lower courts are confused regarding the proper test to apply in tenth amendment cases.

In 1981, the Supreme Court reinterpreted the doctrine announced in *National League of Cities*. *Hodel v. Virginia Surface Mining and Reclamation Association* upheld challenged provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 which establishes minimum standards for states to apply when administering individual mining programs. The Court framed a three-part test

---

200. *Id.* at 574.

201. 426 U.S. at 851.

202. *Id.* at 856 (Blackmun, J., concurring). Justice Blackmun stated that the federal government still retains power in areas where the federal interest in regulating is "demonstrably greater and where state... compliance with imposed federal standards would be essential." *Id.*

203. See, e.g., *Tennessee v. Louisville & N. R.R.*, 478 F. Supp. 199, 206 (M.D. Tenn. 1979) (since Blackmun's concurrence was the swing vote, it could not be ignored; therefore, it was impossible to apply any test emanating from the *National League* opinions). See also *Arizona v. Atchison, T. & S.F. R.R.*, 656 F.2d 398, 407-09 (9th Cir. 1981) (applied Blackmun's balancing test and upheld § 306 of the Railroad Revitalization Act as a legitimate means to achieve a constitutional goal under the commerce power—revitalizing the nation's rail system); *United Transp. Union v. Long Island R.R.*, 634 F.2d 19, 24, 29 (2d Cir. 1980) (applied Blackmun's balancing approach and found that a local, state-owned commuter rail service was an integral government function not subject to federal regulation).


207. 452 U.S. at 289.
to apply the holding of *National League of Cities*. First, the challenged regulation must regulate "States as States." Second, the regulation must address a subject that is indisputably an "attribute of State sovereignty." Third, a State's compliance with the federal regulation must directly impair its ability to "structure integral operations in areas of traditional governmental functions." In a footnote, the Court incorporated the Blackmun balancing approach from *National League of Cities*, noting that even if a state satisfied the three-part test, an overriding federal interest could still overcome the tenth amendment challenge. The Court found that the challenged statute applied to private individuals and businesses, and therefore failed the first element of the test.

3. Relating the Tenth Amendment to Refugee Resettlement

Congress controls the admission of all aliens pursuant to its "naturalization" power. Once an alien has entered the country, however, this constitutional power loses force. It is, therefore, unclear what power Congress exercises when resettling refugees. The Refugee Act of 1980, and the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, primarily rely upon the spending power. While Title II of

208. *Id.* at 287-88.
209. *Id.* (quoting *National League*, 426 U.S. at 854).
212. *See supra* note 206.
213. 452 U.S. at 288 n.29.
214. 452 U.S. at 288, 293. The plaintiffs had argued first, that federally established minimum standards within which the states could administer their own programs were coercive; and second, that the Act usurped the states' police power to control land use. *Id.* at 289. The Court held that the area of regulation was within commerce, so that federal law preempted state law under the supremacy clause. *Id.* at 290. It further held that Congress could displace state exercises of the police power when exercising the commerce power. *Id.*

In some legislation, Congress has expressly indicated that it was acting in the interest of national security. *See Senate Judiciary Committee Print, supra* note 97, at
the Refugee Act of 1980, concerning admissions, is based upon the "naturalization" power, the balance of the Act concerns the welfare of refugees and local communities after entry. Hence, these sections are probably enacted under the spending power.

The Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 was also enacted pursuant to the spending power. First, it arose from the House Committee on Education and Labor, thus evidencing no connection to foreign policy or national security. Moreover, the entire Act is devoted to aiding school districts experiencing the impact of high refugee enrollment. Therefore, refugee resettlement programs are exercises of Congress' spending power and are thus subject to the limits of that power.

The applicability of National League of Cities and Hodel to refugee resettlement is indirect. First, both decisions applied to the commerce power. While they are not strictly limited to commerce power regulation, it is unclear which congressional powers they affect. Second, the source of the power Congress exercises when resettling refugees is also unclear, though usually it is the spending power.

In National League of Cities, the Court expressed no opinion on whether the tenth amendment would limit the spending power as well as the commerce power. Justice Brennan, dissenting in National League of Cities, clearly believed that the Court's tenth amendment limit on the commerce power did not extend to congressional


220. U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 4. "The Congress shall have Power . . . [t]o establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization." Id.
223. See supra text accompanying notes 156-160.
224. See supra text accompanying notes 216-23.
225. 426 U.S. at 852 n.17.
actions under the spending power.\textsuperscript{226}

Courts have been reluctant to apply tenth amendment limitations to other powers.\textsuperscript{227} In \textit{Steward Machine Co. v. Davis},\textsuperscript{228} the Supreme Court held that Congress may place restrictions or conditions on the use of money it appropriates to states and local governments pursuant to the spending power, so long as such conditions are not coercive.\textsuperscript{229} Recent lower court decisions, however, apply this standard inconsistently.\textsuperscript{230}

At one end of the spectrum, some courts\textsuperscript{231} hold that conditions on appropriations are never coercive. For example, in \textit{Oklahoma v. Schweiker}\textsuperscript{232} the District of Columbia Circuit Court analyzed the limits on Congress’ power to condition dispersal of federal funds.\textsuperscript{233}

\textsuperscript{226} Id. at 880 (Brennan, J., dissenting).

\textsuperscript{227} See, e.g., Walker Field Pub. Airport Auth. v. Adams, 606 F.2d 290 (10th Cir. 1979) (dictum) (refused to extend tenth amendment to the spending power); Peel v. Florida Dep’t of Transp., 600 F.2d 1070 (5th Cir. 1979) (refused to apply tenth amendment to the war power); Marshall v. Owensboro-Daviess County Hosp., 581 F.2d 116 (6th Cir. 1978) (refused to extend tenth amendment’s application to include the fourteenth amendment).


\textsuperscript{229} 301 U.S. at 585.

\textsuperscript{230} See infra notes 231-62 and accompanying text.

\textsuperscript{231} See, e.g., American Fed’n of Labor v. Kahn, 618 F.2d 784, 794 (D.C. Cir. 1979) (dictum) (citing \textit{Steward Machine Co.} for the proposition that incentives never equal coercion); Oklahoma v. Harris, 480 F. Supp. 581, 588 (D.D.C. 1979) (since compliance with “pass through” provisions of Social Security Act was optional, it did not coerce states); Texas Landowners Rights Ass’n v. Harris, 453 F. Supp. 1025, 1028-31 (D.D.C.), aff’d, 598 F.2d 311 (D.C. Cir. 1978) (upheld National Flood Insurance Program, stating that Congressional inducements offered to states to achieve legitimate national goals are within the spending power). See also Note, \textit{Federal Grants}, supra note 228, at 144-46.

\textsuperscript{232} 655 F.2d 401 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

\textsuperscript{233} Id. at 405-11.
The court found that the Supreme Court had not yet articulated any limits. 234 Although the court believed that some limit might exist, 235 it held that the “pass-through” provisions of the Social Security Act 236 were within the scope of Congress’ spending power. 237 The court stated that judicial limits on Congress’ power to spend money would involve the judiciary in the legislative process. 238

In considering whether the tenth amendment limited Congress’ spending power 239 the Schweiker court first distinguished National League of Cities on two grounds. First, it noted that National League of Cities dealt with the commerce power. 240 Thus, it found that National League of Cities did not apply to the spending power. 241 Second, the court distinguished the challenged act in National League of Cities from the statutory provisions challenged in Schweiker. 242 The Fair Labor Standards Act at issue in National League of Cities left the states with virtually no discretion in its implementation. 243 The Social Security Act provisions at issue in Schweiker, however, merely required states to maintain their current programs. 244 The court noted that prior decisions had upheld more cumbersome conditions on federal funds. 245

In New Hampshire Department of Employment Security v. Marshall, 246 the First Circuit reached a similar result through different

---

234. Id. at 406.
235. Id. The court noted that the Supreme Court has not only failed to enunciate the standards, but has specifically declined the opportunity to do so in Fullilove v. Klutznick, 448 U.S. 448 (1980); Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 536 (1974); and United States v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936). 655 F.2d at 406.
237. 655 F.2d at 406.
238. Id. at 410.
239. Id. at 411-14.
240. Id. at 411.
241. Id. at 412.
242. Id. at 412-13.
243. Id. at 412.
244. Id. at 412-13.
245. Id. at 413. The court cited Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974) (required an elimination of language barriers); Rosado v. Wyman, 397 U.S. 397 (1970) (state-defined need levels must incorporate cost of living increases), and several district court opinions that ordered changes in state decision making processes. 655 F.2d at 413.
246. 616 F.2d 240 (1st Cir.), cert. denied and appeal dismissed, 449 U.S. 806 (1980).
analysis. The court there observed that *National League of Cities* could be interpreted as holding either that the tenth amendment is superior to the commerce clause, or that the tenth amendment prohibits federal infringement on the states' integral government functions. Relying on the second interpretation, the court found the evidence of impairment of state sovereignty to be insufficient. Thus, the court upheld the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, which contains requirements that states must satisfy to enable employers within their jurisdiction to receive federal tax credits. This decision leaves open the possibility that a state could invalidate a spending power statute by demonstrating infringement of state sovereignty.

At the other end of the spectrum, at least one judge and a few commentators have expressed the view that few states and local governments cannot afford to turn down "optional" federal grants offered through the spending power. Therefore, grants with burden-

247. *Id.* at 248.

248. *Id.*

249. *Id.* at 249.


251. *Id.* § 3304.


While the *Schweiker* court and the *Marshall* court differed in their approaches to the question of how far Congress can go in conditioning federal spending, other courts have sidestepped the issue and decided cases on procedural grounds. See, e.g., Walker Field Pub. Airport Auth. v. Adams, 606 F.2d 290 (10th Cir. 1979) (dismissed a claim challenging the federal condition in a grant, holding that the Court of Claims had exclusive jurisdiction; the court also noted that optional grants are never coercive); County of Los Angeles v. Marshall, 442 F. Supp. 1186, 1188-89 (D.D.C. 1977) (under 26 U.S.C. § 7421(a), the Anti-Injunction Act, the court did not have jurisdiction to decide on the plaintiffs' allegation that the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1976 infringed upon state sovereignty as ultra vires actions Congress exercised under the spending power), aff'd, 631 F.2d 767 (D.C. Cir.), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 837 (1980). See also Note, *Conditional Spending Power, supra* note 228, at 228-32.


some conditions effectively coerce compliance, thus violating the limits of the spending power under *Steward Machine* and infringing on integral state functions under *National League of Cities*.  

4. Applying the *Hodel* Test to Refugee Resettlement

As mentioned above, *Hodel* clarified the proper test for a tenth amendment challenge to congressional action. First, the challenged regulation must regulate "States as States." Admittedly, federal refugee admission and resettlement policies do not directly regulate states. Federal policies in this area, however, have forced some states and localities to absorb an extraordinary number of aliens. This, in turn, has forced state and local governments to restructure their government operations to address the new problems that arise. Although this regulation is indirect, it certainly affects "States as States," since it affects the manner in which they provide government services.  

Second, federal regulation must address a subject that is indisputably an "attribute of state sovereignty." Federal refugee resettlement policies affect state sovereignty in the areas of budget control and public health. In the area of budget control, federal refugee resettlement policies rely on state welfare programs. For the first three years that refugees receive welfare benefits, the federal government pays all related expenses. Thereafter, the state and federal government share the costs. Thus, states still absorb just under half the cost of welfare programs for refugees who have been in the...

---

255. *See supra* note 228 and accompanying text.  
256. *See supra* note 197 and text accompanying notes 198-204.  
257. *See supra* text accompanying notes 208-11.  
258. 452 U.S. at 287-88.  
259. *See supra* notes 14-18 and accompanying text.  
261. At least two commentators believe that the freedom to provide government services is the essence of an "integral governmental function." *See Michelman, supra* note 204, at 1172; Tribe, *National League of Cities and the Right to Government Services*, 90 HARV. L. REV. 1065 (1977).  
262. 452 U.S. at 288.  
263. *See infra* notes 279-80.  
264. *See supra* notes 45-67 and accompanying text. Refugees initially receive welfare benefits to ensure that their basic needs are met.  
265. *See supra* note 144 and text accompanying notes 64-66.
United States for more than three years. Hence, when federal refugee policies increase the number of recipients on the welfare rolls, the states are responsible for part of the added cost. Moreover, federal regulations often condition state participation in federal programs, and the conditions sometimes force states to pay higher benefits than they otherwise would.

In the area of public health, inferior health conditions in some refugee settlements threaten communities with large refugee populations. Local officials must sponsor programs to combat the problem. In short, federal policies regarding refugee admissions and resettlement result in immense costs to certain states and localities, thus taxing their ability to provide government services to their citizens. These burdens inevitably infringe on "attributes of state sovereignty."

The third element of the Hodel test is that state compliance with federal regulation must directly impair the states’ ability to "structure integral operations in areas of traditional functions." The Supreme Court attempted to define this element in United Transpor-

266. See supra note 144.

267. The federal government determines who to admit to the country. It also has a role in determining where the refugees locate. See supra text accompanying notes 78-93.

268. Although the states are reimbursed for the first three years, refugees may be eligible for welfare benefits for a longer time. See supra notes 62-63.

269. See, e.g., Shea v. Vialpando, 416 U.S. 251 (1974) (the federal statute requires state agencies to take into account all transportation expenses when determining the eligibility requirements for Aid to Families with Dependent Children). See also Note, supra note 14, at 908-09.

270. See Note, supra note 14, at 909. The author notes that in 1979, 600 families in Los Angeles County received federally funded aid under the state AFDC program, even though they did not meet the state standard of need. These families qualified because a federal law prohibits discontinuation of benefits to employed refugees. Id., citing California Commission on Human Resources, Report of Findings to the Gen. Assembly (1979).

271. See supra note 39.

272. Because most localities have limited revenues, essential programs and those receiving some federal funding receive priority in budget decisions. Remaining funds go to less significant programs. Because the refugee programs are federally supported and many serve basic human needs, these programs receive priority. Government services for citizens, aside from the welfare and social services programs, therefore, tend to lose resources.

273. 452 U.S. at 288.
tation Union v. Long Island Railroad Co. Noting the difficulty in determining whether a federal law impairs areas of traditional state functions, the Court relied on which branch of government had performed the function previously. The Court also indicated a need to determine whether federal regulation in this area would endanger the separate existence of the state. Evaluating these factors, the Court found the Railway Labor Act could be applied to a state-owned railroad.

States could use the same arguments to develop the third element of the test that they would use with the second. Federal policies regarding refugee admissions and resettlement directly affect states' operations in the areas of government services and public health. Because states have traditionally provided these services and each state must regulate its own budget to maintain a separate existence, federal regulation should be precluded by the Hodel test. But even assuming, arguendo, that a state met all three elements of the Hodel test, the federal government could still overcome a state's tenth amendment claim by showing a greater federal interest. The federal interest in refugee admissions is substantial. Foreign relations require a uniform, national policy on this subject. Moreover, there is no question that, constitutionally, the federal government has exclusive, plenary power over the admission of all aliens. Thus, the federal interest in refugee admissions may be greater than state

274. 102 S. Ct. 1349 (1982).
275. Id. at 1354.
276. Id. at 1354-55, citing National League of Cities v. Usery, 426 U.S. 833, 851 (1976). At issue in Long Island was the regulation of state owned passenger railroads. Because the federal government has regulated railroads in interstate commerce since 1862 (see 102 S. Ct. at 1355 n.13), the Court held that operation of a railroad is not an integral operation in an area traditionally immune from federal regulation. Id. at 1354.
278. 102 S. Ct. at 1356.
280. In Walker Field v. Adams, 606 F.2d 290 (10th Cir. 1979), Judge McKay observed that current state budgets are virtually stretched to the breaking point. Id. at 298-99 (McKay, J., dissenting). Given the various public services that states traditionally provide to their citizens (see National League, 426 U.S. at 851), control over a state budget is arguably an integral governmental function.
281. 452 U.S. at 288 n.29.
282. See supra notes 81-95 and accompanying text.
tenth amendment interests. The state functions on which federal pol-
icy infringe, budget control and public health maintenance, may be
inferior to the federal government's power to regulate the admission
of aliens. Assuming that there is an overriding federal interest,
however, state and local governments still suffer injuries as a con-
sequence of federal policy. Full compensation from the federal govern-
ment to state and local governments, for all the costs relating to
refugees would reduce this burden.

B. Policy Considerations

As shown above, the federal refugee policies burden state and local
communities. Congress recognized this when it enacted the Refugee
Senate Committee Report accompanying the Refugee Act of 1980
demonstrates Congress' belief that the federal government
"clearly has a responsibility to assist States and local communities in
resettling the refugees—assisting them until they are self-supporting
and contributing members of their adopted communities. The
Committee expected that Title III of the Act, which provides fed-
eral reimbursement for refugee expenses, would accomplish this
goal. Local officials working with refugees, however, complain that
this goal has not been achieved.

283. Application here of Blackmun's balancing approach (National League, 426
U.S. at 856 (Blackmun, J., concurring)) would permit federal regulations concerning
refugees. Since the federal government brings the refugees into the country, the fed-
eral interest in their welfare is great. State compliance with these federal standards is
essential to ensure that refugee needs are met. Hence, on balance, the federal policies
should prevail.

284. See Select Commission Report, supra note 3, at 188 (Final Report and
Recommendations).

Ad. News 141.
289. See supra notes 144-51 and accompanying text.
& Ad. News 151.
291. See 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 288 (state-
ment of Kyle S. McKinsey, Deputy Director, California Department of Social Serv-
ces, that Indochinese refugees in California are often not self-sufficient within 24 or
36 months); id. at 292 (statement of Joseph H. Ryu, Coordinator, Indochina Refugee
The House Committee Report accompanying the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980\(^{292}\) demonstrates that the House Committee on Education and Labor believes refugee expenses are a federal responsibility.\(^{293}\) Other officials ranging from the President\(^{294}\) to local politicians\(^{295}\) have also stated that the cost of refugee resettlement should be a national expense. Public sentiment and federalism support the idea that the federal government should fully compensate state and local governments for the costs of refugee resettlement.

C. Solutions

The solutions to the problem of refugee resettlement costs are legislative. Although the congressional reports demonstrate a congressional intent for full federal financing of refugee resettlement,\(^{296}\) subsequent legislation has not implemented that intent.\(^{297}\) State and


\(^{293}\) The Committee firmly believes that these State and local educational agencies should not be required to absorb on their own the enormous costs generated by a situation completely beyond their control. . . the huge flow of Cuban, Haitian and Indochinese refugees is primarily a result of federal refugee policies; therefore, the Federal Government has a responsibility to carry as much of the financial burden as possible.

\(^{294}\) See Remarks on Signing the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 into Law, 16 WEEKLY COMP. PRES. Docs. 2155, 2156 (Oct. 20, 1980) (statement of President Carter that the Cuban-Haitian resettlement problem was a national problem for which he assumed full responsibility).

\(^{295}\) See, e.g., 1979 Subcommittee Hearings on H.R. 2816, supra note 4, at 272 (statement of Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray, that it would be more just to insure that the costs are spread equally throughout the country); id. at 380 (statement of Minnesota Governor Albert H. Quie that refugees are here as a result of national, not state, policies); SELECT COMMISSION REPORT, supra note 3, at 55 (app. H) (position of Dewey W. Knight, Jr., Assistant County Manager, Dade County, Florida, that it is the federal government's responsibility to make policy, but local tax funds should not be used on international issues).

\(^{296}\) See supra notes 287, 288, & 292 and accompanying text.

\(^{297}\) See Refugee Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96-212, 94 Stat. 102, which limits federal reimbursement for cash and medical assistance to three years.
local governments still bear many of the costs associated with refugees. Congress should amend the refugee legislation to state more precisely its intent to cover all the expenses associated with refugee resettlement. The appropriate federal agencies should then promulgate concise regulations stating what aid is available to state and local governments. Recognizing the finite limits of state and local government budgets and the inconsistencies in refugee influx, the reimbursement system should be as expeditious as possible.

Judicial remedies for refugee-impacted states and local communities are scarce. As noted above, there is a tenable tenth amendment argument that federal refugee policies interfere with integral state government functions. Considering the tenor of the courts when dealing in the area of foreign policy, however, this argument is not likely to succeed. There are also tenable, though strained, tort and fifth amendment arguments.

**CONCLUSION**

The costs related to refugees and undocumented aliens are essentially a national responsibility. The federal government exercises full control over all alien admissions. A few state and local governments

---

298. See supra notes 30-77 and accompanying text.
299. See supra notes 273-84 and accompanying text.
300. See L. Tribe, supra note 82, at 227.

Also, although the Act waives immunity for certain torts, compensable injuries generally include only those for which a private person would also be liable. Indian Towing v. United States, 350 U.S. 61, 68-69 (1955). Therefore, public injuries may not be recoverable under the Act. See 1 L. Jayson, Handling Federal Tort Claims § 212 (1981).

302. An argument could be made under the fifth amendment’s just compensation clause. U.S. Const. amend. V, cl. 4. A municipality or state that has diverted considerable resources to aid refugees or undocumented aliens could argue that such diversion constituted a “taking” under the fifth amendment. Again, this theory is tenuous at best. Decisions defining “taking” for fifth amendment purposes generally do not include this type of action within the scope of the fifth amendment. See generally L. Tribe, supra note 82, § 4-5; 1 L. Jayson, supra note 301, § 212.05.
however, have been forced to carry a disproportionate share of the financial burden. The judiciary seems reluctant to interfere in refugee resettlement because of the unquestioned plenary power the federal government has to oversee all foreign affairs.\textsuperscript{303} Thus, the remedy to this dilemma is legislative. If Congress fails to address the problems facing refugee-impacted and undocumented alien-impacted areas, however, the courts should provide remedies for these injustices.

\textsuperscript{303} At least one court, however, has taken an active role in the general area of alien admissions. See Haitian Refugee Center v. Civiletti, 503 F. Supp. 442 (S.D. Fla. 1980) (enjoined the INS from proceeding with deportation proceedings against Haitian refugees until the INS improved its procedures). On appeal, the Fifth Circuit modified, finding this injunctive relief to be overbroad in some respects. Haitian Refugee Center v. Smith, 676 F.2d 1023, 1041 (5th Cir. 1982).