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In Aldous Huxley’s novel *Brave New World*, children are grown in factories and cared for by the state. Luckily, no government has yet managed to intrude that far into family life. But many governments do so in less obvious ways. One of these is by passing laws requiring private companies to provide generous family benefits.

Aside from the moral question of whether the state should be allowed to force such rules on people and firms, there is the basic economic question of who is in the best position to make these kinds of decisions: government planner or employers?

Anyone who has ever run a business knows that making decisions about employment contracts is complicated. When government planners attempt to force one solution for employment contracts, they make it difficult for many companies to be efficient. In the end, this makes all of society poorer.

Each firm must be able to decide on the wage and benefit packages that meet its own special needs, as well as those of its employees. Some employers offer generous “family-friendly” benefits because they want to attract family-minded employees, who are often seen as stable and reliable workers. Some offer family benefits simply because they are philanthropic. Either way, there is no need to have those decisions made by legislation. Government legislation is rarely flexible enough to give firms the freedom to decide just how generous a benefit package should be, or what combination of benefits should be included.

Some firms may not wish to attract a workforce of mothers and fathers. The work in question may require a lot of travel, or be otherwise disruptive to family life. Or the firm’s business may be with gays or other groups that do not form traditional families. Firms may also choose to give higher wages to all employees, rather than giving specific family benefits to some.

Finally, employers and employees should be allowed to bargain for wages and benefits without this being controlled by the state. After all, we are talking about their jobs, their money, and their freedom.