

**Ferdie J. Deering**

## 'Made-Work' Jobs Yield Very Little

**O**NE of the principal fallacies in the proposed Humphrey - Hawkins plan for achieving full employment by putting those out of work on government payrolls is seldom mentioned.

Critics have pointed out costs to taxpayers, damage to private enterprise, and socialistic implications. Not much has been said about the long demonstrated fact that "made-work" projects yield little of lasting value, while training workers to perform at minimum levels. Productivity is very low.

Government already is the largest employer in the United States, with one out of every six employed persons receiving his or her pay from some branch of government. The total of more than 14 million people in government is 2½ times the 1950 figure.

The "guaranteed jobs" bill, which has been endorsed by all major candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination, proposes to make government "the employer of last resort." As presented, it could make

government "the employer of first resort."

Recent reports indicate that about \$40,000 is needed for industry or business to create one new job. Calculations are not available on what might be required for government to create a "new job," all costs included. Maybe \$100,000, perhaps more.

It would be a lot better and cheaper to cut government spending and adjust taxes so that industry could provide more jobs. The drain of industry earnings by high taxes has hampered accumulation of capital with which to create jobs.

Full employment has been defined as a situation under which there are useful and rewarding employment opportunities for all adult Americans willing and able to work. That last phrase—willing and able to work—is the key to unemployment.

Not everybody is able to work, and those who cannot work should not be tabulated to inflate unemployment statistics. Perhaps those who are unwilling to work should not be tabulated, either. At least, they should be

listed in separate columns from those willing to work.

Taxpayers should be concerned with the vast difference between government made-work and industrial job creation. This difference means taxpayers must provide perhaps \$5,000 a year in unemployment and welfare benefits, plus tax avoidance, for an idle worker, or industry must pay that person \$8,000, more or less, for doing productive work.

Government's proper function is to provide a climate for a productive economy. It is the responsibility of free enterprise to provide jobs by producing goods and services the public wants.

Critics of our economic system claim that 6 per cent of the world's population consumes 30 to 40 per cent of the world's goods, implying that this is wrong. They never stress that the same 6 per cent produces more than 50 per cent of the world's goods, as this would emphasize that good living is a result of productive work.