

keep our state Unemployment Compensation Act, which pays the highest benefits of any state in the Union. But, when a UAW-CIO man is laid off, in addition to receiving his full state unemployment payments, they demand that his employer pay him supplemental benefits. The idea is that a fellow should get just about the same income all the time — whether he's working or not.

This may sound like a good deal, but I wouldn't touch it with a ten-foot pole.

Can you think of any better way to knock out a man's initiative? What incentive does a fellow have to look for work, if he can get his full salary 26 weeks in a row without lifting a hand?

There's at least a little streak of laziness — some desire to get something for nothing—in everyone. Why go so far out of our way to encourage it?

I figure I'm about as honest and self-reliant as the next guy. But I live in a part of Michigan where hunting and fishing are terrific, and I love them both. For years I've been hankering for a long trip outdoors. And I have some UAW-CIO buddies who'd sure like to come along. With the union's proposed supplemental unemployment benefits, we could all go off in the woods for months at a time.

And we could do it on practically full pay. What a temptation!

This incentive-killing plan is bound to increase unemployment. And who's going to pay the unemployment compensation? Who's going to give laid-off UAW-CIO members a sum almost equal to their full wages?

It may come as a shock — but *you* are! You, and everyone else who buys automobiles and trucks and other things UAW-CIO men make. You'll pay for it in higher prices.

I'm a member of a group called the Michigan Information Committee, and we just put out a pamphlet that explains it this way:

Both the state unemployment money and the private unemployment funds are paid by employers; but they get *their* money from you — the citizens — in what you pay for their goods and services.

The only way employers can afford to pay these increased incentive-destroying unemployment benefits is to raise prices. If the amount of increased prices were used to improve production, you'd get some value from paying the higher price. But you can't get any value from paying higher prices used only to support idleness.

Under the proposed plan, most of our wage goes into our weekly pay envelope, and the rest into a reserve fund. But I say, if money is taken from a working man's pay, it should be placed in an in-

dividual account, to be used the way he wants—and not put into a general fund.

Who will pay the most into this fund? I'll tell you. The men who've worked the longest and steadiest. Who will get the most out of it? That's easy. The man who's worked the shortest, and who's the least steady. You can work every day for 20 years, put money in the fund each week, and draw out nothing. Another guy can come along, work in UAW-CIO for just two years, and get just about full pay for 26 weeks of loafing. This is unfair. Worse than that—it's socialistic.

The Way It Adds Up

Add them all up: UAW-CIO's dictatorial methods, its wage-leveling, its monopoly, and its incentive-killing G.A.W. scheme. What do you get? The first big step toward socialism, and a kind

of union bossism that's hard for any self-respecting American to accept.

But don't get me wrong. I went to work when I was 17, and have carried a union card since the third day on the job. Man and boy, I've been a working man and a union man most of my life. Chances are, I'll be one till the day I die. More than that, that's what my father was before me.

Through the years I've seen the unions do a lot of good. But it's high time they began to clean house and get rid of their abuses. Like any other organization, unions have a responsibility—to their members and to all the other citizens — to help keep alive the principles of liberty and individualism, including personal initiative and self-reliance. It is these principles, which are now so much in danger, that have made us the freest and most prosperous people on the face of the earth.

Free and Unequal

ALL MEN have an equal right to the free development of their faculties; they have an equal right to the impartial protection of the state; but it is not true, it is against all the laws of reason and equity, it is against the eternal nature of things, that the indolent man and the laborious man, the spendthrift and the economist, the imprudent and the wise, should obtain and enjoy an equal amount of goods.

VICTOR COUSIN, 1848