

考試科目	專業英文	所別	地政系	考試時間	5月10日(六)第 1 節
<p>1. Given that the population of Taiwan is projected to decrease in the near future, please analyze the possible positive (25%) AND negative (25%) consequences that may happen to Taiwan in ENGLISH, and explain why.</p> <p>2. (1) Please translate the FIRST THREE paragraphs of the following excerpt into Chinese (25%), and then; (2) write down your opinions on the content of the excerpt, OR provide some real cases in Taiwan that might match the descriptions in the exempt in either Chinese or English (English is preferred though), and explain why. (25%)</p> <p>"By building an effective transportation network, government transportation spending draws jobs to those industries that benefit from the investment. At the same time, this shift of resources moves jobs away from activities that would have been financed in the absence of the transportation investment. So while transportation investment can "create jobs," it can also destroy them. The overall effect is positive only when it creates more and better jobs, or more and better economic activity, than it eliminates.</p> <p>Determining whether a project's effects are going to be positive or negative can be difficult. A transportation investment might shift jobs, not just across industries and sectors, but also across counties and states. Even a transportation investment that destroys more jobs than it creates can look good, especially in the short term, from the perspective of the winning state or city. Gains and losses might be unevenly distributed, temporally as well as spatially. For example, building an ill-advised rail line might give a local economy a short-term boost in employment, only to saddle taxpayers with large operating deficits in the future.</p> <p>From a national perspective, and over time, gains that are immediate and obvious can be—and often are—outweighed by diffuse losses elsewhere. Suppose federal money was used to build a new highway link between a port and freight rail hub. The new link might cut delivery time within the region. The prospect of improved inventory management, increased sales, and other sources of profit would draw cargo to that port, increase port jobs, expand employment related to regional highway goods movement, and</p>					
備	註 試題隨卷繳交				

考試科目	專業英文	所別	地政系	考試時間	5月10日(六)第 1 節
------	------	----	-----	------	---------------

increase business at the rail hub. At the same time, it would likely reduce traffic to competing ports in other regions and create exactly the same chain reaction—in reverse—in those other areas. Employment would be lost as business is attracted to the competing port. The economy as a whole would be better off only if the increased productivity in the target area exceeded the cost of the highway investment and the loss of business in competing regions.

Not all transportation investments meet these criteria. In the example above, suppose the highway link was built not at the high-productivity port, but instead, because of political considerations, in a region that has a less-busy port with little congestion. While more people in the less-productive region are employed in the construction of the facility, people in the more-productive region are likely to lose jobs, and the overall effect is likely to be negative. That is precisely why a "bridge to nowhere" in one particular state is a poor national investment even though it may benefit construction workers and others where it is built. In Los Angeles, the Alameda Corridor freight rail project greatly improved connectivity between the ports and the ground freight shipment system, but some of its benefits must be offset by calculating the growth that it redirected away from other ports such as Seattle or Oakland, given that shipping is a highly competitive economic sector.

The Interstate Highway System, the nation's greatest transportation investment project, created jobs near interchanges when new businesses took advantage of the improved accessibility. At the same time, other towns that were bypassed "died on the vine." Most analysts and lay citizens believe that, overall, the gains exceeded the losses by an enormous margin, and thus that the Interstate System was justified as a national investment. But not every city, road, or interchange benefited equally."

(Source: Wachs, M., 2011. Transportation, Jobs, and Economic Growth. Access, 38. http://www.uctc.net/access/38/access38_transportation_growth.shtml)

備

註 試題隨卷繳交