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**Limiting the number of Immigrants in the USA**

Immigration has considerable benefits – a more competitive labor force, a more significant base of expertise, expanded demand, and a greater diversity of creativity. Immigration is problematic, however, as well. It can be argued that immigration can cause overcrowding, pollution, and additional strain on public facilities. There is also a discussion as to whether the immigration of non-skilled workers would lead to lower pay and even unemployment. These are questions that can be discussed when concluding whether the immigration numbers should be limited or not. In contrast, USA immigration has numerical limits on categories for admitting into the country, including classes for some relatives of US citizens, immediate family members of permanent residents, employment-based visas, diversity visas, and refugee admissions. This paper will explain why there should be an adjustment in the current numerical limits regarding the categories of people entering the country.

It is essential to first understand the pros and cons of immigrants into the US and use it to determine whether the numerical limits should be adjusted upwards or downwards. To begin with, immigration has benefits, and so do flaws when people coming into the country are not regulated or if the number is too high, low, or perfect. Depending on the people allowed inside the country per year, the country in question will be affected differently. So, what exactly are the benefits of immigration?

The growth in workforce size and the rise of production capability in the economy would result in net immigration. Immigration leads to increased economic growth and subsequent increases in tax revenue and government spending capacity (Costa, 18-44).

It is suggested that many refugees come with no money and are thus more encouraged to want to make something for themselves. Furthermore, workers who wish to leave a country to try out a new enterprise are the most adventurous and eager to face chances. As a result, the labor force is usually more diverse. Young and mobile immigrants are also expected to be pioneers – companies that produce creative goods. The American economy illustrates how refugees have gained their living conditions and a greater variety of products and services and have come to the Americas and set up classic American firms. For instance, Steve's (Apple) dad was from Syria: Abdul Fattah Jandali. Scottish Alexander Graham Bell (AT&T telephone). The Cuban immigrant son of Jeff Bezos (Amazon). Amazon. The Russian immigrant is Sergey Brin (Google).

One fear of immigration is that 'immigrants are getting jobs from indigenous people,' But it's known as the artistry lump. The illusion that there are still set numbers of workers. However, if refugees come into the United States or the UK to win work, they can invest their income in their new country to create new demand for services and products. Immigrants contribute much from 'taking jobs' to GDP growth. Fifteen million people settled in the US between 1900 and 1915, but it was a time of low unemployment and strong economic growth. The fast pace of growth was driven by immigration (US growth was more than 4% from 1890 to 1910).

In the United Kingdom, refugees employed in the workforce have further education and skills. For instance, at 21 or older, only 20% of UK people completed school. However, up to 21 or later, 53 percent of new immigrants were educated. (The 2012 LSE Study) Immigration encourages the industry to recruit highly qualified professionals to fill jobs and further increase tax income (Gelatt).

As immigrants are younger and workers than indigenous peoples, they give government revenues net benefits. Workers pay payroll taxes but are not entitled to benefits like education or retirement. Young people are less likely than older adults to access health insurance. For example, HMRC from the British Government shows that EEA citizens pay £15.5 billion more in income tax and domestic insurance in 2015-16 than in tax credits and child welfare. An Oxford Economics (2018) report has found the most significant fiscal advantage for new immigrants from the EEA (+4,7 bn), small-cost non-EEA immigrants (€ -9,0), and the most effective net tax burden for UK-born residents (-€ 41,0 bn).

The consequences of migration depend on the immigrant type. Non-EEA migrants in the United Kingdom are more expensive, requiring more senior citizens who will move for family reasons (therefore negative tax impact).

There is more to immigration than looking at the number of people present in the country to grab jobs and other employment opportunities. The big picture is not how many people want to be in the United States legally more than the current numerical number but what the country will gain from these people. This includes, but is not limited to, the better-skilled labor force, increased company growth due to diversity in the workplace, potential entrepreneurs, and better economic output (Jones, 19). With all these said, the number of people coming into the USA should be increased in the mentioned categories based on the outlined benefits this will have on the country. The law agencies should look at it from the 'how will the country benefit' point of view and not 'how many people want to come into the country.
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