

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: National Economic Council
Series/Staff Member: Gene Sperling
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 19196
FolderID:

Folder Title:
[Minimum Wage Issues] [1]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	18	1	5	1

MIN WAGE - "It's time to
raise the min. wage."
7/3/96

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE
THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT
July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first sixth months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

► **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**

- The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
- The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
- Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE
THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT
July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first six months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

► **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**

- The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
- The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
- Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE
THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT
July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first sixth months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

- ▶ **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**
 - The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
 - The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
 - Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE
THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT
July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first sixth months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

► **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**

- The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
- The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
- Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE
THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT
July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first six months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

► **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**

- The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
- The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
- Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT

July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first sixth months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

► **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**

- The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
- The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
- Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE
THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT
July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first sixth months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

► **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**

- The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
- The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
- Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE
THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT
July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first sixth months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

► **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**

- The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
- The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
- Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE
THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT
July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first sixth months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

► **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**

- The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
- The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
- Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE
THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD DROP THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT
July 3, 1996

IT'S TIME FOR SENATE REPUBLICANS TO JOIN THE MAINSTREAM AND RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE. If we want to make work pay, we must make the minimum wage a living wage. President Clinton's minimum wage increase would ensure that -- along with his expanded Earned Income Tax Credit -- no parent who works full-time would have to raise their children in poverty. A bipartisan group in the House has done their part and voted to raise the minimum wage. The time for the Senate Republicans to do the same is long overdue.

MAIN STREET AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST VOTE ON THE MINIMUM WAGE WITHOUT ANY POISON PILLS. The Senate should pass an increase in the minimum wage -- with no poison pills, no gimmicks, and no political games. That's the best way to help the American people make the most out of their own lives. As Republican Congressman Amo Houghton said: *"This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."*

DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU -- THEIR POISON PILL AMENDMENT TO A GOOD MINIMUM WAGE BILL WILL DENY A PAY RAISE TO MILLIONS OF WORKERS. The Senate Republican leadership offers the American people nothing more than a cruel shell game: claim that you are raising the minimum wage, but stick millions of first-rate workers with second-rate pay.

IF THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP INSIST ON INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POISON PILL AMENDMENTS, THE PRESIDENT WILL VETO THE BILL:

- ▶ **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.** The Republican leadership would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage. For these workers, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.
- ▶ **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.** The Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision would deny the opportunity of a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage.
- ▶ **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.** As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force America's lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. While President Clinton says now is the time to raise the minimum wage, the Republicans are telling America's workers to wait. The Republican's six-month delay will cost a full-time minimum wage worker \$878. When you're making only \$8,500 a year, \$878 makes a big difference.

EVERY DAY THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DELAYS A HONEST MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, ITS REAL VALUE MOVES CLOSER TO A 40-YEAR LOW. The American people want the minimum wage increased. A bipartisan majority in the Senate wants the minimum wage increased. If we truly value work and family, we should raise the value of the minimum wage now.

**DON'T LET REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOOL YOU:
THEIR POISON PILL MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT WILL STICK MILLIONS
OF FIRST-RATE WORKERS WITH SECOND-RATE PAY**

INSTEAD OF JUST PASSING A CLEAN, SIMPLE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, THE SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP WANTS A POISON PILL AMENDMENT THAT WILL DENY MILLIONS OF WORKERS A PAY RAISE. President Clinton is determined to raise the minimum wage for all workers who deserve and need it. If they send him a bill with poison pills, he will veto it:

► **Workers In Two-Thirds Of All Businesses Would Be Denied The Benefits Of A Higher Minimum Wage.**

- The Senate Republican leadership's amendment would deny workers in two-thirds of all firms in the United States -- all business with revenues of less than \$500,000 annually -- an increase in the minimum wage.
- This provision is *far more extreme* than any previous small business exemption. It is true that prior to 1989 there was an exemption for employees in small retail and service establishments. But the Republican's current proposal would not only exempt workers in small retail and service firms, but would deny a higher minimum wage to *all* workers in two-thirds of America's businesses, including many garment industry sweatshop workers, farmworkers, and janitorial workers.
- For workers in small businesses, this provision would lock in, for an indefinite period, a minimum wage that will be at a 40-year low in real terms. It doesn't matter the size of your employer, you can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour.

► **Over 4 Million Hard-Working Americans Would Be Denied A Pay Raise:**

- The Senate Republican's so-called "Opportunity Wage" provision could deny a higher minimum wage to the 4.1 million workers at or near the minimum wage who have been with their employer for less than six months. Under this provision any new hire of any employer, regardless of prior work experience, could be paid a sub-minimum wage for the first sixth months of employment.
- This is a more extreme provision than the House-passed minimum wage increase. The House-passed bill -- which the Administration strongly opposes -- applied a sub-minimum wage for workers under age 20 for their first 90 days with an employer. This amendment, by contrast, would deny a higher minimum wage to all workers for the first 180 days of employment.
- In industries with high turnover -- like retail -- this would create the opportunity for employers to drop workers after six months, so that they would never graduate from the sub-minimum wage. And the anti-displacement provisions, intended to prohibit employers from dropping workers in a perpetual "churning" fashion, will prove to be extremely difficult to enforce.

► **Low-Wage Workers Would Have To Wait Until Next Year For Pay Hike.**

- The Republican leadership would put off the first stage of a minimum wage increase until January 1, 1997. As the real value of the minimum wage approaches a 40-year low, the Republican leadership wants to force our lowest-paid workers to wait until next year to see any minimum wage increase. President Clinton is determined to not let the minimum wage reach a 40-year low and will veto any bill that will let that happen.

PRESIDENT CLINTON ALSO STRONGLY OPPOSES REPUBLICAN MEASURES TO DENY PAY INCREASES TO OTHER WORKERS:

► **"Tipped Employees" Such As Waiters and Waitresses Would Be Denied A Pay Raise.**

- The Republican leadership would freeze the minimum wage for "tipped employees" such as waiters, waitresses, and delivery people at \$2.13 an hour, thus denying any current or future minimum wage increase to these workers.
- The impact of this tip credit amendment hits women particularly hard; about 80 percent of tipped workers are women.
- Tipped workers would receive a 45-cents an hour pay increase with the President's proposal. To many of these workers struggling to make ends meet, this small sum can make the difference between getting by and slipping through the cracks.

MIN WAGE STATE BY STATE
4/01/96

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S MINIMUM WAGE PROPOSAL WILL BENEFIT WORKING AMERICANS IN EVERY STATE

State-By-State Data From The Bureau Of Labor Statistics

April 1, 1996

Monday, April 1, marked the five-year anniversary of the last minimum wage increase. President Clinton has proposed a raise in the minimum wage by 90 cents over two years. This raise will mean an additional \$1,800 in earnings for full-time minimum wage workers - enough to buy seven months of groceries.

Of the ten million American workers who would benefit from the raise in the minimum wage, two-thirds are adults, age 20 or over. The average minimum-wage worker brings home half of the family's earnings. Three out of five minimum wage workers are women.

The following is a state-by-state breakdown of the number of workers in each state who would benefit from the President's minimum wage proposal:

ALABAMA: President Clinton's proposal to increase the minimum wage would directly benefit 241,000 workers in Alabama, representing 22.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ALASKA: Alaska has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

ARIZONA: Benefits 183,000 workers in Arizona, representing 15.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ARKANSAS: Benefits 144,000 workers in Arkansas, representing 21.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CALIFORNIA: Benefits 1,220,000 workers in California, representing 16.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

COLORADO: Benefits 99,000 workers in Colorado, representing 9.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CONNECTICUT: Benefits 76,000 workers in Connecticut, representing 9.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

DELAWARE: Benefits 20,000 workers in Delaware, representing 10.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

FLORIDA: Benefits 523,000 workers in Alabama, representing 15.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

GEORGIA: Benefits 239,000 workers in Georgia, representing 12.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

HAWAII: Hawaii has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

IDAHO: Benefits 50,000 workers in Idaho, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ILLINOIS: Benefits 388,000 workers in Illinois, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

INDIANA: Benefits 232,000 workers in Indiana, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

IOWA: Benefits 122,000 workers in Iowa, representing 14.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KANSAS: Benefits 137,000 workers in Kansas, representing 19.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KENTUCKY: Benefits 182,000 workers in Georgia, representing 17.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

LOUISIANA: Benefits 246,000 workers in Louisiana, representing 24.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MAINE: Benefits 41,000 workers in Maine, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MARYLAND: Benefits 103,000 workers in Maryland, representing 8.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MASSACHUSETTS: Benefits 136,000 workers in Massachusetts, representing 8.5 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MICHIGAN: Benefits 324,000 workers in Michigan, representing 11.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MINNESOTA: Benefits 118,000 workers in Minnesota, representing 8.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSISSIPPI: Benefits 162,000 workers in Mississippi, representing 25.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSOURI: Benefits 222,000 workers in Missouri, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MONTANA: Benefits 44,000 workers in Montana, representing 19.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEBRASKA: Benefits 68,000 workers in Nebraska, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEVADA: Benefits 57,000 workers in Nevada, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Benefits 30,000 workers in New Hampshire, representing 8.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW JERSEY: Benefits 133,000 workers in New Jersey, representing 7.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW MEXICO: Benefits 62,000 workers in New Mexico, representing 15.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW YORK: Benefits 475,000 workers in New York, representing 12.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH CAROLINA: Benefits 265,000 workers in North Carolina, representing 13.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH DAKOTA: Benefits 37,000 workers in North Dakota, representing 22.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OHIO: Benefits 440,000 workers in Ohio, representing 13.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OKLAHOMA: Benefits 174,000 workers in Oklahoma, representing 24.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OREGON: Benefits 82,000 workers in Oregon, representing 9.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

PENNSYLVANIA: Benefits 430,000 workers in Pennsylvania, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

RHODE ISLAND: Benefits 31,000 workers in Rhode Island, representing 11.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH CAROLINA: Benefits 156,000 workers in South Carolina, representing 15.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH DAKOTA: Benefits 32,000 workers in South Dakota, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TENNESSEE: Benefits 242,000 workers in Tennessee, representing 16.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TEXAS: Benefits 943,000 workers in Texas, representing 20.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

UTAH: Benefits 69,000 workers in Utah, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VERMONT: Benefits 19,000 workers in Georgia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VIRGINIA: Benefits 197,000 workers in Virginia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WASHINGTON: Benefits 138,000 workers in Washington, representing 9.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WEST VIRGINIA: Benefits 83,000 workers in West Virginia, representing 19.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WISCONSIN: Benefits 209,000 workers in Wisconsin, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WYOMING: Benefits 25,000 workers in Wyoming, representing 20.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

#

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S MINIMUM WAGE PROPOSAL WILL BENEFIT WORKING AMERICANS IN EVERY STATE

State-By-State Data From The Bureau Of Labor Statistics

April 1, 1996

Monday, April 1, marked the five-year anniversary of the last minimum wage increase. President Clinton has proposed a raise in the minimum wage by 90 cents over two years. This raise will mean an additional \$1,800 in earnings for full-time minimum wage workers - enough to buy seven months of groceries.

Of the ten million American workers who would benefit from the raise in the minimum wage, two-thirds are adults, age 20 or over. The average minimum-wage worker brings home half of the family's earnings. Three out of five minimum wage workers are women.

The following is a state-by-state breakdown of the number of workers in each state who would benefit from the President's minimum wage proposal:

ALABAMA: President Clinton's proposal to increase the minimum wage would directly benefit 241,000 workers in Alabama, representing 22.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ALASKA: Alaska has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

ARIZONA: Benefits 183,000 workers in Arizona, representing 15.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ARKANSAS: Benefits 144,000 workers in Arkansas, representing 21.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CALIFORNIA: Benefits 1,220,000 workers in California, representing 16.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

COLORADO: Benefits 99,000 workers in Colorado, representing 9.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CONNECTICUT: Benefits 76,000 workers in Connecticut, representing 9.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

DELAWARE: Benefits 20,000 workers in Delaware, representing 10.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

FLORIDA: Benefits 523,000 workers in Alabama, representing 15.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

GEORGIA: Benefits 239,000 workers in Georgia, representing 12.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

HAWAII: Hawaii has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

IDAHO: Benefits 50,000 workers in Idaho, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ILLINOIS: Benefits 388,000 workers in Illinois, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

INDIANA: Benefits 232,000 workers in Indiana, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

IOWA: Benefits 122,000 workers in Iowa, representing 14.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KANSAS: Benefits 137,000 workers in Kansas, representing 19.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KENTUCKY: Benefits 182,000 workers in Georgia, representing 17.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

LOUISIANA: Benefits 246,000 workers in Louisiana, representing 24.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MAINE: Benefits 41,000 workers in Maine, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MARYLAND: Benefits 103,000 workers in Maryland, representing 8.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MASSACHUSETTS: Benefits 136,000 workers in Massachusetts, representing 8.5 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MICHIGAN: Benefits 324,000 workers in Michigan, representing 11.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MINNESOTA: Benefits 118,000 workers in Minnesota, representing 8.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSISSIPPI: Benefits 162,000 workers in Mississippi, representing 25.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSOURI: Benefits 222,000 workers in Missouri, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MONTANA: Benefits 44,000 workers in Montana, representing 19.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEBRASKA: Benefits 68,000 workers in Nebraska, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEVADA: Benefits 57,000 workers in Nevada, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Benefits 30,000 workers in New Hampshire, representing 8.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW JERSEY: Benefits 133,000 workers in New Jersey, representing 7.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW MEXICO: Benefits 62,000 workers in New Mexico, representing 15.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW YORK: Benefits 475,000 workers in New York, representing 12.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH CAROLINA: Benefits 265,000 workers in North Carolina, representing 13.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH DAKOTA: Benefits 37,000 workers in North Dakota, representing 22.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OHIO: Benefits 440,000 workers in Ohio, representing 13.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OKLAHOMA: Benefits 174,000 workers in Oklahoma, representing 24.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OREGON: Benefits 82,000 workers in Oregon, representing 9.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

PENNSYLVANIA: Benefits 430,000 workers in Pennsylvania, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

RHODE ISLAND: Benefits 31,000 workers in Rhode Island, representing 11.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH CAROLINA: Benefits 156,000 workers in South Carolina, representing 15.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH DAKOTA: Benefits 32,000 workers in South Dakota, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TENNESSEE: Benefits 242,000 workers in Tennessee, representing 16.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TEXAS: Benefits 943,000 workers in Texas, representing 20.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

UTAH: Benefits 69,000 workers in Utah, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VERMONT: Benefits 19,000 workers in Georgia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VIRGINIA: Benefits 197,000 workers in Virginia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WASHINGTON: Benefits 138,000 workers in Washington, representing 9.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WEST VIRGINIA: Benefits 83,000 workers in West Virginia, representing 19.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WISCONSIN: Benefits 209,000 workers in Wisconsin, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WYOMING: Benefits 25,000 workers in Wyoming, representing 20.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

#

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S MINIMUM WAGE PROPOSAL WILL BENEFIT WORKING AMERICANS IN EVERY STATE

State-By-State Data From The Bureau Of Labor Statistics

April 1, 1996

Monday, April 1, marked the five-year anniversary of the last minimum wage increase. President Clinton has proposed a raise in the minimum wage by 90 cents over two years. This raise will mean an additional \$1,800 in earnings for full-time minimum wage workers - enough to buy seven months of groceries.

Of the ten million American workers who would benefit from the raise in the minimum wage, two-thirds are adults, age 20 or over. The average minimum-wage worker brings home half of the family's earnings. Three out of five minimum wage workers are women.

The following is a state-by-state breakdown of the number of workers in each state who would benefit from the President's minimum wage proposal:

ALABAMA: President Clinton's proposal to increase the minimum wage would directly benefit 241,000 workers in Alabama, representing 22.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ALASKA: Alaska has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

ARIZONA: Benefits 183,000 workers in Arizona, representing 15.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ARKANSAS: Benefits 144,000 workers in Arkansas, representing 21.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CALIFORNIA: Benefits 1,220,000 workers in California, representing 16.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

COLORADO: Benefits 99,000 workers in Colorado, representing 9.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CONNECTICUT: Benefits 76,000 workers in Connecticut, representing 9.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

DELAWARE: Benefits 20,000 workers in Delaware, representing 10.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

FLORIDA: Benefits 523,000 workers in Alabama, representing 15.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

GEORGIA: Benefits 239,000 workers in Georgia, representing 12.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

HAWAII: Hawaii has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

IDAHO: Benefits 50,000 workers in Idaho, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ILLINOIS: Benefits 388,000 workers in Illinois, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

INDIANA: Benefits 232,000 workers in Indiana, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

IOWA: Benefits 122,000 workers in Iowa, representing 14.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KANSAS: Benefits 137,000 workers in Kansas, representing 19.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KENTUCKY: Benefits 182,000 workers in Georgia, representing 17.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

LOUISIANA: Benefits 246,000 workers in Louisiana, representing 24.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MAINE: Benefits 41,000 workers in Maine, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MARYLAND: Benefits 103,000 workers in Maryland, representing 8.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MASSACHUSETTS: Benefits 136,000 workers in Massachusetts, representing 8.5 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MICHIGAN: Benefits 324,000 workers in Michigan, representing 11.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MINNESOTA: Benefits 118,000 workers in Minnesota, representing 8.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSISSIPPI: Benefits 162,000 workers in Mississippi, representing 25.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSOURI: Benefits 222,000 workers in Missouri, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MONTANA: Benefits 44,000 workers in Montana, representing 19.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEBRASKA: Benefits 68,000 workers in Nebraska, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEVADA: Benefits 57,000 workers in Nevada, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Benefits 30,000 workers in New Hampshire, representing 8.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW JERSEY: Benefits 133,000 workers in New Jersey, representing 7.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW MEXICO: Benefits 62,000 workers in New Mexico, representing 15.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW YORK: Benefits 475,000 workers in New York, representing 12.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH CAROLINA: Benefits 265,000 workers in North Carolina, representing 13.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH DAKOTA: Benefits 37,000 workers in North Dakota, representing 22.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OHIO: Benefits 440,000 workers in Ohio, representing 13.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OKLAHOMA: Benefits 174,000 workers in Oklahoma, representing 24.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OREGON: Benefits 82,000 workers in Oregon, representing 9.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

PENNSYLVANIA: Benefits 430,000 workers in Pennsylvania, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

RHODE ISLAND: Benefits 31,000 workers in Rhode Island, representing 11.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH CAROLINA: Benefits 156,000 workers in South Carolina, representing 15.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH DAKOTA: Benefits 32,000 workers in South Dakota, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TENNESSEE: Benefits 242,000 workers in Tennessee, representing 16.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TEXAS: Benefits 943,000 workers in Texas, representing 20.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

UTAH: Benefits 69,000 workers in Utah, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VERMONT: Benefits 19,000 workers in Georgia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VIRGINIA: Benefits 197,000 workers in Virginia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WASHINGTON: Benefits 138,000 workers in Washington, representing 9.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WEST VIRGINIA: Benefits 83,000 workers in West Virginia, representing 19.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WISCONSIN: Benefits 209,000 workers in Wisconsin, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WYOMING: Benefits 25,000 workers in Wyoming, representing 20.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

#

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S MINIMUM WAGE PROPOSAL WILL BENEFIT WORKING AMERICANS IN EVERY STATE

State-By-State Data From The Bureau Of Labor Statistics

April 1, 1996

Monday, April 1, marked the five-year anniversary of the last minimum wage increase. President Clinton has proposed a raise in the minimum wage by 90 cents over two years. This raise will mean an additional \$1,800 in earnings for full-time minimum wage workers - enough to buy seven months of groceries.

Of the ten million American workers who would benefit from the raise in the minimum wage, two-thirds are adults, age 20 or over. The average minimum-wage worker brings home half of the family's earnings. Three out of five minimum wage workers are women.

The following is a state-by-state breakdown of the number of workers in each state who would benefit from the President's minimum wage proposal:

ALABAMA: President Clinton's proposal to increase the minimum wage would directly benefit 241,000 workers in Alabama, representing 22.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ALASKA: Alaska has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

ARIZONA: Benefits 183,000 workers in Arizona, representing 15.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ARKANSAS: Benefits 144,000 workers in Arkansas, representing 21.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CALIFORNIA: Benefits 1,220,000 workers in California, representing 16.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

COLORADO: Benefits 99,000 workers in Colorado, representing 9.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CONNECTICUT: Benefits 76,000 workers in Connecticut, representing 9.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

DELAWARE: Benefits 20,000 workers in Delaware, representing 10.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

FLORIDA: Benefits 523,000 workers in Alabama, representing 15.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

GEORGIA: Benefits 239,000 workers in Georgia, representing 12.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

HAWAII: Hawaii has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

IDAHO: Benefits 50,000 workers in Idaho, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ILLINOIS: Benefits 388,000 workers in Illinois, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

INDIANA: Benefits 232,000 workers in Indiana, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

IOWA: Benefits 122,000 workers in Iowa, representing 14.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KANSAS: Benefits 137,000 workers in Kansas, representing 19.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KENTUCKY: Benefits 182,000 workers in Georgia, representing 17.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

LOUISIANA: Benefits 246,000 workers in Louisiana, representing 24.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MAINE: Benefits 41,000 workers in Maine, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MARYLAND: Benefits 103,000 workers in Maryland, representing 8.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MASSACHUSETTS: Benefits 136,000 workers in Massachusetts, representing 8.5 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MICHIGAN: Benefits 324,000 workers in Michigan, representing 11.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MINNESOTA: Benefits 118,000 workers in Minnesota, representing 8.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSISSIPPI: Benefits 162,000 workers in Mississippi, representing 25.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSOURI: Benefits 222,000 workers in Missouri, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MONTANA: Benefits 44,000 workers in Montana, representing 19.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEBRASKA: Benefits 68,000 workers in Nebraska, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEVADA: Benefits 57,000 workers in Nevada, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Benefits 30,000 workers in New Hampshire, representing 8.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW JERSEY: Benefits 133,000 workers in New Jersey, representing 7.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW MEXICO: Benefits 62,000 workers in New Mexico, representing 15.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW YORK: Benefits 475,000 workers in New York, representing 12.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH CAROLINA: Benefits 265,000 workers in North Carolina, representing 13.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH DAKOTA: Benefits 37,000 workers in North Dakota, representing 22.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OHIO: Benefits 440,000 workers in Ohio, representing 13.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OKLAHOMA: Benefits 174,000 workers in Oklahoma, representing 24.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OREGON: Benefits 82,000 workers in Oregon, representing 9.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

PENNSYLVANIA: Benefits 430,000 workers in Pennsylvania, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

RHODE ISLAND: Benefits 31,000 workers in Rhode Island, representing 11.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH CAROLINA: Benefits 156,000 workers in South Carolina, representing 15.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH DAKOTA: Benefits 32,000 workers in South Dakota, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TENNESSEE: Benefits 242,000 workers in Tennessee, representing 16.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TEXAS: Benefits 943,000 workers in Texas, representing 20.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

UTAH: Benefits 69,000 workers in Utah, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VERMONT: Benefits 19,000 workers in Georgia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VIRGINIA: Benefits 197,000 workers in Virginia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WASHINGTON: Benefits 138,000 workers in Washington, representing 9.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WEST VIRGINIA: Benefits 83,000 workers in West Virginia, representing 19.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WISCONSIN: Benefits 209,000 workers in Wisconsin, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WYOMING: Benefits 25,000 workers in Wyoming, representing 20.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

#

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S MINIMUM WAGE PROPOSAL WILL BENEFIT WORKING AMERICANS IN EVERY STATE

State-By-State Data From The Bureau Of Labor Statistics

April 1, 1996

Monday, April 1, marked the five-year anniversary of the last minimum wage increase. President Clinton has proposed a raise in the minimum wage by 90 cents over two years. This raise will mean an additional \$1,800 in earnings for full-time minimum wage workers - enough to buy seven months of groceries.

Of the ten million American workers who would benefit from the raise in the minimum wage, two-thirds are adults, age 20 or over. The average minimum-wage worker brings home half of the family's earnings. Three out of five minimum wage workers are women.

The following is a state-by-state breakdown of the number of workers in each state who would benefit from the President's minimum wage proposal:

ALABAMA: President Clinton's proposal to increase the minimum wage would directly benefit 241,000 workers in Alabama, representing 22.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ALASKA: Alaska has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

ARIZONA: Benefits 183,000 workers in Arizona, representing 15.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ARKANSAS: Benefits 144,000 workers in Arkansas, representing 21.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CALIFORNIA: Benefits 1,220,000 workers in California, representing 16.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

COLORADO: Benefits 99,000 workers in Colorado, representing 9.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CONNECTICUT: Benefits 76,000 workers in Connecticut, representing 9.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

DELAWARE: Benefits 20,000 workers in Delaware, representing 10.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

FLORIDA: Benefits 523,000 workers in Alabama, representing 15.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

GEORGIA: Benefits 239,000 workers in Georgia, representing 12.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

HAWAII: Hawaii has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

IDAHO: Benefits 50,000 workers in Idaho, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ILLINOIS: Benefits 388,000 workers in Illinois, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

INDIANA: Benefits 232,000 workers in Indiana, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

IOWA: Benefits 122,000 workers in Iowa, representing 14.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KANSAS: Benefits 137,000 workers in Kansas, representing 19.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KENTUCKY: Benefits 182,000 workers in Georgia, representing 17.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

LOUISIANA: Benefits 246,000 workers in Louisiana, representing 24.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MAINE: Benefits 41,000 workers in Maine, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MARYLAND: Benefits 103,000 workers in Maryland, representing 8.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MASSACHUSETTS: Benefits 136,000 workers in Massachusetts, representing 8.5 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MICHIGAN: Benefits 324,000 workers in Michigan, representing 11.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MINNESOTA: Benefits 118,000 workers in Minnesota, representing 8.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSISSIPPI: Benefits 162,000 workers in Mississippi, representing 25.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSOURI: Benefits 222,000 workers in Missouri, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MONTANA: Benefits 44,000 workers in Montana, representing 19.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEBRASKA: Benefits 68,000 workers in Nebraska, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEVADA: Benefits 57,000 workers in Nevada, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Benefits 30,000 workers in New Hampshire, representing 8.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW JERSEY: Benefits 133,000 workers in New Jersey, representing 7.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW MEXICO: Benefits 62,000 workers in New Mexico, representing 15.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW YORK: Benefits 475,000 workers in New York, representing 12.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH CAROLINA: Benefits 265,000 workers in North Carolina, representing 13.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH DAKOTA: Benefits 37,000 workers in North Dakota, representing 22.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OHIO: Benefits 440,000 workers in Ohio, representing 13.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OKLAHOMA: Benefits 174,000 workers in Oklahoma, representing 24.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OREGON: Benefits 82,000 workers in Oregon, representing 9.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

PENNSYLVANIA: Benefits 430,000 workers in Pennsylvania, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

RHODE ISLAND: Benefits 31,000 workers in Rhode Island, representing 11.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH CAROLINA: Benefits 156,000 workers in South Carolina, representing 15.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH DAKOTA: Benefits 32,000 workers in South Dakota, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TENNESSEE: Benefits 242,000 workers in Tennessee, representing 16.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TEXAS: Benefits 943,000 workers in Texas, representing 20.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

UTAH: Benefits 69,000 workers in Utah, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VERMONT: Benefits 19,000 workers in Georgia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VIRGINIA: Benefits 197,000 workers in Virginia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WASHINGTON: Benefits 138,000 workers in Washington, representing 9.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WEST VIRGINIA: Benefits 83,000 workers in West Virginia, representing 19.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WISCONSIN: Benefits 209,000 workers in Wisconsin, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WYOMING: Benefits 25,000 workers in Wyoming, representing 20.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

#

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S MINIMUM WAGE PROPOSAL WILL BENEFIT WORKING AMERICANS IN EVERY STATE

State-By-State Data From The Bureau Of Labor Statistics

April 1, 1996

Monday, April 1, marked the five-year anniversary of the last minimum wage increase. President Clinton has proposed a raise in the minimum wage by 90 cents over two years. This raise will mean an additional \$1,800 in earnings for full-time minimum wage workers - enough to buy seven months of groceries.

Of the ten million American workers who would benefit from the raise in the minimum wage, two-thirds are adults, age 20 or over. The average minimum-wage worker brings home half of the family's earnings. Three out of five minimum wage workers are women.

The following is a state-by-state breakdown of the number of workers in each state who would benefit from the President's minimum wage proposal:

ALABAMA: President Clinton's proposal to increase the minimum wage would directly benefit 241,000 workers in Alabama, representing 22.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ALASKA: Alaska has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

ARIZONA: Benefits 183,000 workers in Arizona, representing 15.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ARKANSAS: Benefits 144,000 workers in Arkansas, representing 21.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CALIFORNIA: Benefits 1,220,000 workers in California, representing 16.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

COLORADO: Benefits 99,000 workers in Colorado, representing 9.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CONNECTICUT: Benefits 76,000 workers in Connecticut, representing 9.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

DELAWARE: Benefits 20,000 workers in Delaware, representing 10.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

FLORIDA: Benefits 523,000 workers in Alabama, representing 15.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

GEORGIA: Benefits 239,000 workers in Georgia, representing 12.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

HAWAII: Hawaii has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

IDAHO: Benefits 50,000 workers in Idaho, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ILLINOIS: Benefits 388,000 workers in Illinois, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

INDIANA: Benefits 232,000 workers in Indiana, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

IOWA: Benefits 122,000 workers in Iowa, representing 14.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KANSAS: Benefits 137,000 workers in Kansas, representing 19.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KENTUCKY: Benefits 182,000 workers in Georgia, representing 17.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

LOUISIANA: Benefits 246,000 workers in Louisiana, representing 24.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MAINE: Benefits 41,000 workers in Maine, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MARYLAND: Benefits 103,000 workers in Maryland, representing 8.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MASSACHUSETTS: Benefits 136,000 workers in Massachusetts, representing 8.5 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MICHIGAN: Benefits 324,000 workers in Michigan, representing 11.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MINNESOTA: Benefits 118,000 workers in Minnesota, representing 8.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSISSIPPI: Benefits 162,000 workers in Mississippi, representing 25.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSOURI: Benefits 222,000 workers in Missouri, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MONTANA: Benefits 44,000 workers in Montana, representing 19.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEBRASKA: Benefits 68,000 workers in Nebraska, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEVADA: Benefits 57,000 workers in Nevada, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Benefits 30,000 workers in New Hampshire, representing 8.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW JERSEY: Benefits 133,000 workers in New Jersey, representing 7.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW MEXICO: Benefits 62,000 workers in New Mexico, representing 15.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW YORK: Benefits 475,000 workers in New York, representing 12.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH CAROLINA: Benefits 265,000 workers in North Carolina, representing 13.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH DAKOTA: Benefits 37,000 workers in North Dakota, representing 22.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OHIO: Benefits 440,000 workers in Ohio, representing 13.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OKLAHOMA: Benefits 174,000 workers in Oklahoma, representing 24.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OREGON: Benefits 82,000 workers in Oregon, representing 9.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

PENNSYLVANIA: Benefits 430,000 workers in Pennsylvania, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

RHODE ISLAND: Benefits 31,000 workers in Rhode Island, representing 11.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH CAROLINA: Benefits 156,000 workers in South Carolina, representing 15.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH DAKOTA: Benefits 32,000 workers in South Dakota, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TENNESSEE: Benefits 242,000 workers in Tennessee, representing 16.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TEXAS: Benefits 943,000 workers in Texas, representing 20.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

UTAH: Benefits 69,000 workers in Utah, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VERMONT: Benefits 19,000 workers in Georgia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VIRGINIA: Benefits 197,000 workers in Virginia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WASHINGTON: Benefits 138,000 workers in Washington, representing 9.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WEST VIRGINIA: Benefits 83,000 workers in West Virginia, representing 19.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WISCONSIN: Benefits 209,000 workers in Wisconsin, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WYOMING: Benefits 25,000 workers in Wyoming, representing 20.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

#

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S MINIMUM WAGE PROPOSAL WILL BENEFIT WORKING AMERICANS IN EVERY STATE

State-By-State Data From The Bureau Of Labor Statistics *April 1, 1996*

Monday, April 1, marked the five-year anniversary of the last minimum wage increase. President Clinton has proposed a raise in the minimum wage by 90 cents over two years. This raise will mean an additional \$1,800 in earnings for full-time minimum wage workers - enough to buy seven months of groceries.

Of the ten million American workers who would benefit from the raise in the minimum wage, two-thirds are adults, age 20 or over. The average minimum-wage worker brings home half of the family's earnings. Three out of five minimum wage workers are women.

The following is a state-by-state breakdown of the number of workers in each state who would benefit from the President's minimum wage proposal:

ALABAMA: President Clinton's proposal to increase the minimum wage would directly benefit 241,000 workers in Alabama, representing 22.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ALASKA: Alaska has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

ARIZONA: Benefits 183,000 workers in Arizona, representing 15.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ARKANSAS: Benefits 144,000 workers in Arkansas, representing 21.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CALIFORNIA: Benefits 1,220,000 workers in California, representing 16.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

COLORADO: Benefits 99,000 workers in Colorado, representing 9.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

CONNECTICUT: Benefits 76,000 workers in Connecticut, representing 9.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

DELAWARE: Benefits 20,000 workers in Delaware, representing 10.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

FLORIDA: Benefits 523,000 workers in Alabama, representing 15.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

GEORGIA: Benefits 239,000 workers in Georgia, representing 12.8 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

HAWAII: Hawaii has already raised its state minimum wage to \$5.25.

IDAHO: Benefits 50,000 workers in Idaho, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

ILLINOIS: Benefits 388,000 workers in Illinois, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

INDIANA: Benefits 232,000 workers in Indiana, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

IOWA: Benefits 122,000 workers in Iowa, representing 14.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KANSAS: Benefits 137,000 workers in Kansas, representing 19.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

KENTUCKY: Benefits 182,000 workers in Georgia, representing 17.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

LOUISIANA: Benefits 246,000 workers in Louisiana, representing 24.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MAINE: Benefits 41,000 workers in Maine, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MARYLAND: Benefits 103,000 workers in Maryland, representing 8.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MASSACHUSETTS: Benefits 136,000 workers in Massachusetts, representing 8.5 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MICHIGAN: Benefits 324,000 workers in Michigan, representing 11.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MINNESOTA: Benefits 118,000 workers in Minnesota, representing 8.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSISSIPPI: Benefits 162,000 workers in Mississippi, representing 25.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MISSOURI: Benefits 222,000 workers in Missouri, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

MONTANA: Benefits 44,000 workers in Montana, representing 19.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEBRASKA: Benefits 68,000 workers in Nebraska, representing 14.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEVADA: Benefits 57,000 workers in Nevada, representing 12.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Benefits 30,000 workers in New Hampshire, representing 8.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW JERSEY: Benefits 133,000 workers in New Jersey, representing 7.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW MEXICO: Benefits 62,000 workers in New Mexico, representing 15.0 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NEW YORK: Benefits 475,000 workers in New York, representing 12.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH CAROLINA: Benefits 265,000 workers in North Carolina, representing 13.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

NORTH DAKOTA: Benefits 37,000 workers in North Dakota, representing 22.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OHIO: Benefits 440,000 workers in Ohio, representing 13.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OKLAHOMA: Benefits 174,000 workers in Oklahoma, representing 24.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

OREGON: Benefits 82,000 workers in Oregon, representing 9.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

PENNSYLVANIA: Benefits 430,000 workers in Pennsylvania, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

RHODE ISLAND: Benefits 31,000 workers in Rhode Island, representing 11.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH CAROLINA: Benefits 156,000 workers in South Carolina, representing 15.6 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

SOUTH DAKOTA: Benefits 32,000 workers in South Dakota, representing 15.9 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TENNESSEE: Benefits 242,000 workers in Tennessee, representing 16.7 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

TEXAS: Benefits 943,000 workers in Texas, representing 20.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

UTAH: Benefits 69,000 workers in Utah, representing 13.1 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VERMONT: Benefits 19,000 workers in Georgia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

VIRGINIA: Benefits 197,000 workers in Virginia, representing 11.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WASHINGTON: Benefits 138,000 workers in Washington, representing 9.3 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WEST VIRGINIA: Benefits 83,000 workers in West Virginia, representing 19.4 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WISCONSIN: Benefits 209,000 workers in Wisconsin, representing 12.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

WYOMING: Benefits 25,000 workers in Wyoming, representing 20.2 percent of all hourly workers in the state.

#

MILWAUKEE - Armen
PACER 4/24/96

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

ARMEY Packet

"THE MINIMUM WAGE FOR FAMILIES ACT"

LEGISLATIVE DESCRIPTION AND SUMMARY

This proposal will fundamentally redesign the EITC, and rename it the "Working Families Support Credit".

RATIONALE

It has become difficult in recent years to support a family on a minimum-wage salary. There is agreement among both Republicans and Democrats that we need to provide assistance to the "working poor", but there is significant disagreement on the best way to accomplish this goal.

The administration has proposed an increase in the minimum wage as the solution to this problem. While such an increase would provide some relief to the working poor, it would also have much more far reaching effects, including placing large economic constraints on the private sector, a loss of entry-level positions, and an inflationary ripple effect on wages. A minimum wage increase would also affect those persons who arguably are not in need of this assistance, such as teenagers working during their summer vacation.

Our proposal would accomplish the goal of providing assistance to those who are truly in need -- working families -- while at the same time avoiding the additional problems associated with a minimum wage increase.

BACKGROUND

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), which was created in 1974, provides a refundable tax credit to lower-income working families with children and currently to some adult childless workers. The EITC has expanded greatly since its creation as a result of both Congressional and Presidential initiatives, including efforts by the Reagan, Bush and Clinton administrations.

RECIPIENTS

Under current law, there are an estimated 18.2 million tax units eligible for EITC. 12.7 million of these tax units are families with children, of whom roughly 5.3 million have one child and 7.4 million have two or more children. The remaining 5.5 million eligible tax units are childless workers ages 25 through 64.

PROPOSAL

This EITC reform proposal, which builds upon the reforms in the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995, will redesign and reform the current EITC program in an effort to return the program to its original purpose of serving low-income working families. The proposal will address the following:

- * Convert large annual "lump sum" EITC payments into equal monthly payments so as to more practically supplement family income
- * Deny credit to undocumented workers
- * Eliminate credit for childless adults
- * Increase the support credit for parents
- * Rename Earned Income Tax Credit the "Working Families Support Credit"

With the savings generated from these reforms, we will significantly increase the amount of credit recipients of the Working Families Support Credit would receive.

If you believe that those people who are in need of wage assistance are America's working families, as opposed to teenagers employer during their summer vacation, please join us in support of The Minimum Wage Increase for Families Act.

If you would like to cosponsor this legislation or if you have additional questions, please contact Chuck Seyfarth with Representative Hutchinson at 5-4301.

There Are 153,900 Stories in Wisconsin's Restaurants. Here's a Great One.

Wisconsin's Success Stories

Cheri Dohse
Cousins Submarines

Cheri Dohse is one of the more than 153,900 people who work in Wisconsin's restaurants.

As a teenager, she started working for Cousins Submarines as a cashier. Her family needed the money and Cheri thought it would make for a nice temporary job.

But Cheri found she couldn't attend college, and then her son Michael arrived. "I thought about going on welfare," Cheri says, "but I decided to stick it out with Cousins."

And Cousins stuck with Cheri.

First they got her into a management training program, and later they paid for her tuition so she could start college.

Today, Cheri Dohse is a District Supervisor for Cousins and oversees seven restaurants. Her next goals are to own a Cousins franchise and to finish her college degree.

When she managed her own Cousins restaurant, Cheri worked with a lot of troubled neighborhood kids from broken homes—sometimes feeding them, sometimes counseling them.

The lesson Cheri tried to teach them is the lesson she learned: A job helps you climb higher. And once you start climbing, there's no telling how high you can go.

Cheri Dohse's story is extraordinary in many ways. But it's pretty typical in America's Restaurants. In fact, more than 60% of managers and owners began in entry level, hourly jobs.



Wisconsin's Restaurants.
Good Jobs. Great People. Extraordinary Opportunity.

This message is proudly brought to you by the Wisconsin Restaurant Association
to celebrate the success stories in America's foodservice industry.

Robert J. Samuelson

Minimum Wage: Stale Symbolism

The debate over the minimum wage is an exercise in stale symbolism. The proposed increase—from the \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15—would not do much to help the poor. It might even hurt them. As such, the minimum wage is less about social policy than politics. Roughly three-quarters of Americans think raising it is the decent thing to do. So opponents are easily stigmatized as cruel. In an election year, this is a simple way for Democrats (who generally favor it) to embarrass Republicans (who don't).

If you doubt that, ponder some facts gathered by New York Times reporter David Rosenbaum. With computers, Rosenbaum had the official presidential papers—including presidential speeches, statements and press conferences—searched to find the number of times Clinton advocated a higher minimum wage in 1993 and 1994, when Democrats controlled Congress. The answer: zero. In 1995 and 1996, with Republicans controlling Congress, Clinton plugged a higher minimum 47 times (through March 11).

Public sympathy for a higher minimum rests on two false beliefs. The first is that there's a permanent group of workers always stuck at the minimum. It follows, then, that if the minimum isn't raised, their buying power constantly erodes to inflation. By this theory, we should find some fixed, irreducible share of workers (say, 5 percent) at the minimum.

Well, we don't. Even at the bottom of the wage scale, inflation and competition for workers gradually raise pay rates. Between 1981 and early 1990, the minimum wage remained at \$3.35. What happened? In 1981 there were 7.8 million workers at the minimum, or nearly 8 percent of 100 million workers. By 1989, only 3.2 million workers received the minimum, about 3 percent of the 117 million workers. If the minimum had stayed at \$3.35, almost no one would receive it now. In 1995 3.7 million workers were at the \$4.25 minimum, 3 percent of the 125 million workers.

The second myth is that many minimum-wage workers are family heads. In one press release, the Labor Department says that 40 percent of minimum-wage workers "are the sole breadwin-

ners of their family." The implication is that their low wages constitute an important source of poverty and hardship for children. Not so.

To justify its statement, the Labor Department counts single people living by themselves as family heads—a definition that, though defensible, defies common sense. In 1995 only 28 percent of minimum-wage workers were married. Many were not in poverty, because the family had two earners. Others didn't have children. Obviously, some single parents earned the minimum wage. One study puts their number at about 3 percent of minimum-wage workers.

One familiar argument for a higher minimum is that a full-time worker at the minimum should have enough income to escape poverty. For singles, this is no problem. Someone working 40 hours a week at \$4.25 an hour earns \$8,840 a year, which is above the poverty line of \$7,900 for singles. But the Labor Department complains that a full-time worker with three dependents can't reach the poverty line of \$15,600.

This may be, but the Labor Department's example is hardly typical. Consider:

- Changes in the minimum don't affect most poor adults, because about 60 percent don't have jobs, and only about 10 percent have year-round, full-time jobs.

- Among minimum-wage workers in 1995, about three-quarters didn't work 40 hours a week. Most (55 percent) were part-timers, working less than 35 hours a week. (The share of part-timers was identical among those earning between \$4.25 and \$5.15 an hour.)

- Most minimum-wage workers aren't poor. In 1990, just before the last increase, about three-quarters came from families with incomes above the poverty line, estimates economist Richard Burkhauser of Syracuse University. About two-thirds had incomes at least 50 percent higher than the poverty line.

Most minimum-wage work consists of part-time, non-career jobs in fast food, retailing or even telemarketing. These jobs are filled heavily by young, single, often middle-class workers. In 1995 two-thirds of them were under 30; only 20 percent were over 40. Even the benefits of a

higher minimum for the poor are exaggerated. Take the Labor Department's family of four. With food stamps and the Earned Income Tax Credit, this family's income (\$14,766) is now only 5 percent below the poverty line. The higher minimum wage would, after changes in food stamps and the EITC, raise the family's income 2 percent above the poverty line—assuming the worker still had a job.

There's the catch. Higher wages, if artificially induced, may price some unskilled workers out of the market. True, some economic research questions whether modest increases in the minimum cause job loss. But this research has been harshly criticized, and most economists believe that every 10 percent rise in the minimum could erase between one percent and 2 percent of affected jobs. By this math, a \$5.15 minimum might jeopardize between 100,000 and 200,000 jobs among younger workers, estimates economist David Neumark of Michigan State University.

All exact estimates are suspect. Economists can't predict the precise effects of small changes in government policies. Because wages are rising anyway, a legislated increase may mainly affect the timing of future changes. At most, the poor might benefit slightly; at worst, they might suffer slightly. The real deception is that something important is being done when all that is occurring is a game of political one-upmanship.

The danger is that people will believe the deception. They will think that government can raise incomes by fiat, when most people advance through their own efforts and skills. If people accept the illusion, they will want bigger (and more damaging) increases in the minimum. Even economists who support the present proposal agree that increases to, say, \$6 or \$7 would cost jobs for the low-skilled. Because a low-paying job is often the best way to a high-paying job, that would be a huge step backward.

No matter. Our leaders are more comfortable with replaying ancient (and irrelevant) debates than facing present problems. These rituals are more than dishonest. They are a sign of political decadence.



Supporting the Efforts of Low Wage Working Americans

Raising the Minimum Wage Is Not the Answer

March 1996

It is an election year, and the parties are once again arguing over the minimum wage. Democrats are right that government has a critical role to play in helping people work their way out of poverty, in raising living standards, and in reducing inequality. Increasing the minimum wage, however, is the wrong strategy to promote these goals.

In 1989, the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) demonstrated that raising the minimum wage could be counterproductive, raising prices for poor people while helping mainly middle class families. Instead, PPI and the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) argued that Congress should reform the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to ensure that people who work full-time, year-round would be able to support their families above the poverty line. In 1990, and again in 1993, Congress expanded the EITC along the lines proposed by PPI, and Congress should reject calls to retreat from this commitment.

At the same time, there are ways to expand opportunities for low wage workers to work their way up the income scale. The key is to cut the deficit while investing in broader prosperity. Congress should repeal up to \$75 billion a year in unproductive industry spending and tax subsidies; the lion's share of these resources should be channeled to deficit reduction. The remainder could be dedicated to public investments to expand access to higher education, through the National Service program and the school-to-work initiative, and to skills enhancement through vouchers for retraining.

These approaches offer sound, market-based assistance for low income workers. By contrast, raising the minimum wage would be, at best, a blunt instrument.

- *The vast majority of minimum wage workers are in families that do not need public wage supports because their incomes are well above the poverty level. Most minimum wage workers are not the sole support of low income families, but secondary workers in moderate or middle income families, or primary workers in families with other significant sources of income. Seventy percent of minimum wage workers are in families well above the poverty level, and nearly 40 percent are in families with incomes in the top half of the income distribution.*
- *More than 75 percent of all poor Americans are ineligible for the minimum wage, and so would not benefit from an increase. They don't qualify because they (1) don't work (the elderly poor as well as the welfare poor), (2) earn more than an increased minimum wage (but work only part-time or part of the year), (3) work for themselves, or (4) work in jobs not covered by the minimum wage law.*

- ▶ *The costs of an increase in the minimum wage would be borne disproportionately by lower income families.* In the short run, a higher minimum wage raises costs and prices, transferring resources from consumers to minimum wage workers. There are some workers in low income families who would benefit significantly, but the vast majority of poor families would have to pay higher prices. Therefore, increasing the minimum wage would produce a regressive transfer, making most poor people a little worse off in order to improve the lives, at least for a time, of a group of people which is predominately non-poor.
- ▶ *A higher minimum wage does not protect jobs.* Some have argued that a higher minimum wage could protect jobs, because the higher wage would give firms an incentive to figure out how to use their minimum wage workers more productively. In effect, these analysts argue that higher wages yield higher productivity, rather than the reverse. There is no reliable empirical evidence to support this view.
- ▶ *In the end, raising the minimum wage would be self-defeating.* Firms initially respond to an increase in the minimum wage in the same way they respond to any increase in fixed costs affecting all competing firms: They will incorporate the cost in higher prices. This will tend to reduce jobs over a longer term, as higher prices reduce demand for the industry's goods and services. Raising the minimum wage will also mean that no firms will hire additional workers whose value to the firm falls between the old minimum wage and the new one. So in many cases, a higher minimum wage can reduce job creation for low skilled people.

*For these reasons, the Democratic Leadership Council and Progressive Policy Institute support other ways of helping low income workers. [The EITC—long supported by PPI and expanded by President Clinton in 1993—is a much better way of targeting benefits to low income working Americans.] For more information on the EITC, see *Work and Poverty: A Progressive View of the Minimum Wage and the Earned Income Tax Credit* (June 1989), and *An American Working Wage: Ending Poverty in Working Families* (February 1990), both by Robert J. Shapiro. We also support the use of vouchers for job training to replace the current system of more than 150 federal training programs—and other changes to empower workers—rather than burden business with additional rules and regulations.*

*The EITC program is not perfect, but many recent criticisms of it are either exaggerated or plainly incorrect. In their quest to attain a balanced budget, many Republicans in Congress have recently been very critical of the EITC program and targeted it for significant reductions. This has occurred even though the program was started by President Ford and received its largest expansion under President Reagan. For more information on why recent criticisms are off the mark, see *GOP Cuts in the EITC: Raising Taxes on the Working Poor* (June 19, 1995) by M. Jeff Hamond and Lyn A. Hogan.*

To order any of these publications, please contact our Publications Department at 1-800-546-0027 (in the Washington, DC metro area call, 202-544-6172), or visit our Web site at <http://www.dlcppi.org/>.

ARMEY Packet

"THE MINIMUM WAGE FOR FAMILIES ACT"

LEGISLATIVE DESCRIPTION AND SUMMARY

This proposal will fundamentally redesign the EITC, and rename it the "Working Families Support Credit".

RATIONALE

It has become difficult in recent years to support a family on a minimum-wage salary. There is agreement among both Republicans and Democrats that we need to provide assistance to the "working poor", but there is significant disagreement on the best way to accomplish this goal.

The administration has proposed an increase in the minimum wage as the solution to this problem. While such an increase would provide some relief to the working poor, it would also have much more far reaching effects, including placing large economic constraints on the private sector, a loss of entry-level positions, and an inflationary ripple effect on wages. A minimum wage increase would also affect those persons who arguably are not in need of this assistance, such as teenagers working during their summer vacation.

Our proposal would accomplish the goal of providing assistance to those who are truly in need -- working families -- while at the same time avoiding the additional problems associated with a minimum wage increase.

BACKGROUND

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), which was created in 1974, provides a refundable tax credit to lower-income working families with children and currently to some adult childless workers. The EITC has expanded greatly since its creation as a result of both Congressional and Presidential initiatives, including efforts by the Reagan, Bush and Clinton administrations.

RECIPIENTS

Under current law, there are an estimated 18.2 million tax units eligible for EITC. 12.7 million of these tax units are families with children, of whom roughly 5.3 million have one child and 7.4 million have two or more children. The remaining 5.5 million eligible tax units are childless workers ages 25 through 64.

PROPOSAL

This EITC reform proposal, which builds upon the reforms in the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995, will redesign and reform the current EITC program in an effort to return the program to its original purpose of serving low-income working families. The proposal will address the following:

- * Convert large annual "lump sum" EITC payments into equal monthly payments so as to more practically supplement family income
- * Deny credit to undocumented workers
- * Eliminate credit for childless adults
- * Increase the support credit for parents
- * Rename Earned Income Tax Credit the "Working Families Support Credit"

With the savings generated from these reforms, we will significantly increase the amount of credit recipients of the Working Families Support Credit would receive.

If you believe that those people who are in need of wage assistance are America's working families, as opposed to teenagers employer during their summer vacation, please join us in support of The Minimum Wage Increase for Families Act.

If you would like to cosponsor this legislation or if you have additional questions, please contact Chuck Seyfarth with Representative Hutchinson at 5-4301.

There Are 153,900 Stories in Wisconsin's Restaurants. Here's a Great One.

Wisconsin's Success Stories

Cheri Dohse
Cousins Submarines

Cheri Dohse is one of the more than 153,900 people who work in Wisconsin's restaurants.

As a teenager, she started working for Cousins Submarines as a cashier. Her family needed the money and Cheri thought it would make for a nice temporary job.

But Cheri found she couldn't afford college, and then her son Michael arrived. "I thought about going on welfare," Cheri says, "but I decided to stick it out with Cousins."

And Cousins stuck with Cheri.

First they got her into a management training program, and later they paid for her tuition so she could start college.

Today, Cheri Dohse is a District Supervisor for Cousins and oversees seven restaurants. Her next goals are to own a Cousins franchise and to finish her college degree.

When she managed her own Cousins restaurant, Cheri worked with a lot of troubled neighborhood kids from broken homes — sometimes feeding them, sometimes counseling them.

The lesson Cheri tried to teach them is the lesson she learned: "A job helps you climb higher. And once you start climbing, there's no telling how high you can go."

Cheri Dohse's story is extraordinary in many ways, but it's pretty typical in America's Restaurants. In fact, more than 84% of managers and owners began in entry-level, hourly jobs.



Wisconsin's Restaurants.
Good Jobs. Great People. Extraordinary Opportunity.

This message is proudly brought to you by the Wisconsin Restaurant Association
to celebrate the success stories in America's foodservice industry.

Robert J. Samuelson

Minimum Wage: Stale Symbolism

The debate over the minimum wage is an exercise in stale symbolism. The proposed increase—from the \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15—would not do much to help the poor. It might even hurt them. As such, the minimum wage is less about social policy than politics. Roughly three-quarters of Americans think raising it is the decent thing to do. So opponents are easily stigmatized as cruel. In an election year, this is a simple way for Democrats (who generally favor it) to embarrass Republicans (who don't).

If you doubt that, ponder some facts gathered by New York Times reporter David Rosenbaum. With computers, Rosenbaum had the official presidential papers—including presidential speeches, statements and press conferences—searched to find the number of times Clinton advocated a higher minimum wage in 1993 and 1994, when Democrats controlled Congress. The answer: zero. In 1995 and 1996, with Republicans controlling Congress, Clinton plugged a higher minimum 47 times (through March 11).

Public sympathy for a higher minimum rests on two false beliefs. The first is that there's a permanent group of workers always stuck at the minimum. It follows, then, that if the minimum isn't raised, their buying power constantly erodes to inflation. By this theory, we should find some fixed, irreducible share of workers (say, 5 percent) at the minimum.

Well, we don't. Even at the bottom of the wage scale, inflation and competition for workers gradually raise pay rates. Between 1981 and early 1990, the minimum wage remained at \$3.35. What happened? In 1981 there were 7.8 million workers at the minimum, or nearly 8 percent of 100 million workers. By 1989, only 3.2 million workers received the minimum, about 3 percent of the 117 million workers. If the minimum had stayed at \$3.35, almost no one would receive it now. In 1995 3.7 million workers were at the \$4.25 minimum, 3 percent of the 125 million workers.

The second myth is that many minimum-wage workers are family heads. In one press release, the Labor Department says that 40 percent of minimum-wage workers "are the sole breadwin-

ners of their family." The implication is that their low wages constitute an important source of poverty and hardship for children. Not so.

To justify its statement, the Labor Department counts single people living by themselves as family heads—a definition that, though defensible, defies common sense. In 1995 only 28 percent of minimum-wage workers were married. Many were not in poverty, because the family had two earners. Others didn't have children. Obviously, some single parents earned the minimum wage. One study puts their number at about 3 percent of minimum-wage workers.

One familiar argument for a higher minimum is that a full-time worker at the minimum should have enough income to escape poverty. For singles, this is no problem. Someone working 40 hours a week at \$4.25 an hour earns \$8,840 a year, which is above the poverty line of \$7,900 for singles. But the Labor Department complains that a full-time worker with three dependents can't reach the poverty line of \$15,600.

This may be, but the Labor Department's example is hardly typical. Consider:

- Changes in the minimum don't affect most poor adults, because about 60 percent don't have jobs, and only about 10 percent have year-round, full-time jobs.

- Among minimum-wage workers in 1995, about three-quarters didn't work 40 hours a week. Most (55 percent) were part-timers, working less than 35 hours a week. (The share of part-timers was identical among those earning between \$4.25 and \$5.15 an hour.)

- Most minimum-wage workers aren't poor. In 1990, just before the last increase, about three-quarters came from families with incomes above the poverty line, estimates economist Richard Burkhauser of Syracuse University. About two-thirds had incomes at least 50 percent higher than the poverty line.

Most minimum-wage work consists of part-time, non-career jobs in fast food, retailing or even telemarketing. These jobs are filled heavily by young, single, often middle-class workers. In 1995 two-thirds of them were under 30; only 20 percent were over 40. Even the benefits of a

higher minimum for the poor are exaggerated. Take the Labor Department's family of four. With food stamps and the Earned Income Tax Credit, this family's income (\$14,766) is now only 5 percent below the poverty line. The higher minimum wage would, after changes in food stamps and the EITC, raise the family's income 2 percent above the poverty line—assuming the worker still had a job.

There's the catch. Higher wages, if artificially induced, may price some unskilled workers out of the market. True, some economic research questions whether modest increases in the minimum cause job loss. But this research has been harshly criticized, and most economists believe that every 10 percent rise in the minimum could erase between one percent and 2 percent of affected jobs. By this math, a \$5.15 minimum might jeopardize between 100,000 and 200,000 jobs among younger workers, estimates economist David Neumark of Michigan State University.

All exact estimates are suspect. Economists can't predict the precise effects of small changes in government policies. Because wages are rising anyway, a legislated increase may mainly affect the timing of future changes. At most, the poor might benefit slightly; at worst, they might suffer slightly. The real deception is that something important is being done when all that is occurring is a game of political one-upsmanship.

The danger is that people will believe the deception. They will think that government can raise incomes by fiat, when most people advance through their own efforts and skills. If people accept the illusion, they will want bigger (and more damaging) increases in the minimum. Even economists who support the present proposal agree that increases to, say, \$6 or \$7 would cost jobs for the low-skilled. Because a low-paying job is often the best way to a high-paying job, that would be a huge step backward.

No matter. Our leaders are more comfortable with replaying ancient (and irrelevant) debates than facing present problems. These rituals are more than dishonest. They are a sign of political decadence.



Supporting the Efforts of Low Wage Working Americans

Raising the Minimum Wage Is Not the Answer

March 1996

It is an election year, and the parties are once again arguing over the minimum wage. Democrats are right that government has a critical role to play in helping people work their way out of poverty, in raising living standards, and in reducing inequality. Increasing the minimum wage, however, is the wrong strategy to promote these goals.

In 1989, the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) demonstrated that raising the minimum wage could be counterproductive, raising prices for poor people while helping mainly middle class families. Instead, PPI and the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) argued that Congress should reform the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to ensure that people who work full-time, year-round would be able to support their families above the poverty line. In 1990, and again in 1993, Congress expanded the EITC along the lines proposed by PPI, and Congress should reject calls to retreat from this commitment.

At the same time, there are ways to expand opportunities for low wage workers to work their way up the income scale. The key is to cut the deficit while investing in broader prosperity. Congress should repeal up to \$75 billion a year in unproductive industry spending and tax subsidies; the lion's share of these resources should be channeled to deficit reduction. The remainder could be dedicated to public investments to expand access to higher education, through the National Service program and the school-to-work initiative, and to skills enhancement through vouchers for retraining.

These approaches offer sound, market-based assistance for low income workers. By contrast, raising the minimum wage would be, at best, a blunt instrument.

- ▶ *The vast majority of minimum wage workers are in families that do not need public wage supports because their incomes are well above the poverty level. Most minimum wage workers are not the sole support of low income families, but secondary workers in moderate or middle income families, or primary workers in families with other significant sources of income. Seventy percent of minimum wage workers are in families well above the poverty level, and nearly 40 percent are in families with incomes in the top half of the income distribution.*
- ▶ *More than 75 percent of all poor Americans are ineligible for the minimum wage, and so would not benefit from an increase. They don't qualify because they (1) don't work (the elderly poor as well as the welfare poor), (2) earn more than an increased minimum wage (but work only part-time or part of the year), (3) work for themselves, or (4) work in jobs not covered by the minimum wage law.*

- ▶ *The costs of an increase in the minimum wage would be borne disproportionately by lower income families.* In the short run, a higher minimum wage raises costs and prices, transferring resources from consumers to minimum wage workers. There are some workers in low income families who would benefit significantly, but the vast majority of poor families would have to pay higher prices. Therefore, increasing the minimum wage would produce a regressive transfer, making most poor people a little worse off in order to improve the lives, at least for a time, of a group of people which is predominately non-poor.
- ▶ *A higher minimum wage does not protect jobs.* Some have argued that a higher minimum wage could protect jobs, because the higher wage would give firms an incentive to figure out how to use their minimum wage workers more productively. In effect, these analysts argue that higher wages yield higher productivity, rather than the reverse. There is no reliable empirical evidence to support this view.
- ▶ *In the end, raising the minimum wage would be self-defeating.* Firms initially respond to an increase in the minimum wage in the same way they respond to any increase in fixed costs affecting all competing firms: They will incorporate the cost in higher prices. This will tend to reduce jobs over a longer term, as higher prices reduce demand for the industry's goods and services. Raising the minimum wage will also mean that no firms will hire additional workers whose value to the firm falls between the old minimum wage and the new one. So in many cases, a higher minimum wage can reduce job creation for low skilled people.

*For these reasons, the Democratic Leadership Council and Progressive Policy Institute support other ways of helping low income workers. [The EITC—long supported by PPI and expanded by President Clinton in 1993—is a much better way of targeting benefits to low income working Americans.] For more information on the EITC, see *Work and Poverty: A Progressive View of the Minimum Wage and the Earned Income Tax Credit* (June 1989), and *An American Working Wage: Ending Poverty in Working Families* (February 1990), both by Robert J. Shapiro. We also support the use of vouchers for job training to replace the current system of more than 150 federal training programs—and other changes to empower workers—rather than burden business with additional rules and regulations.*

The EITC program is not perfect, but many recent criticisms of it are either exaggerated or plainly incorrect. In their quest to attain a balanced budget, many Republicans in Congress have recently been very critical of the EITC program and targeted it for significant reductions. This has occurred even though the program was started by President Ford and received its largest expansion under President Reagan. For more information on why recent criticisms are off the mark, see *GOP Cuts in the EITC: Raising Taxes on the Working Poor* (June 19, 1995) by M. Jeff Hamond and Lyn A. Hogan.

To order any of these publications, please contact our Publications Department at 1-800-546-0027 (in the Washington, DC metro area call, 202-544-6172), or visit our Web site at <http://www.dlcpqi.org/>.

ARMEY Packet

"THE MINIMUM WAGE FOR FAMILIES ACT"

LEGISLATIVE DESCRIPTION AND SUMMARY

This proposal will fundamentally redesign the EITC, and rename it the "Working Families Support Credit".

RATIONALE

It has become difficult in recent years to support a family on a minimum-wage salary. There is agreement among both Republicans and Democrats that we need to provide assistance to the "working poor", but there is significant disagreement on the best way to accomplish this goal.

The administration has proposed an increase in the minimum wage as the solution to this problem. While such an increase would provide some relief to the working poor, it would also have much more far reaching effects, including placing large economic constraints on the private sector, a loss of entry-level positions, and an inflationary ripple effect on wages. A minimum wage increase would also affect those persons who arguably are not in need of this assistance, such as teenagers working during their summer vacation.

Our proposal would accomplish the goal of providing assistance to those who are truly in need -- working families -- while at the same time avoiding the additional problems associated with a minimum wage increase.

BACKGROUND

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), which was created in 1974, provides a refundable tax credit to lower-income working families with children and currently to some adult childless workers. The EITC has expanded greatly since its creation as a result of both Congressional and Presidential initiatives, including efforts by the Reagan, Bush and Clinton administrations.

RECIPIENTS

Under current law, there are an estimated 18.2 million tax units eligible for EITC. 12.7 million of these tax units are families with children, of whom roughly 5.3 million have one child and 7.4 million have two or more children. The remaining 5.5 million eligible tax units are childless workers ages 25 through 64.

PROPOSAL

This EITC reform proposal, which builds upon the reforms in the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995, will redesign and reform the current EITC program in an effort to return the program to its original purpose of serving low-income working families. The proposal will address the following:

- * Convert large annual "lump sum" EITC payments into equal monthly payments so as to more practically supplement family income
- * Deny credit to undocumented workers
- * Eliminate credit for childless adults
- * Increase the support credit for parents
- * Rename Earned Income Tax Credit the "Working Families Support Credit"

With the savings generated from these reforms, we will significantly increase the amount of credit recipients of the Working Families Support Credit would receive.

If you believe that those people who are in need of wage assistance are America's working families, as opposed to teenagers employer during their summer vacation, please join us in support of The Minimum Wage Increase for Families Act.

If you would like to cosponsor this legislation or if you have additional questions, please contact Chuck Seyfarth with Representative Hutchinson at 5-4301.

There Are 153,900 Stories in Wisconsin's Restaurants. Here's a Great One.

Wisconsin's Success Stories

Cheri Dohse
Cousins Submarines

Cheri Dohse is one of the more than 153,900 people who work in Wisconsin's restaurants.

As a teenager, she started working for Cousins Submarines as a cashier. Her family needed the money and Cheri thought it would make for a nice temporary job.

But Cheri found she couldn't afford college, and then her son Michael arrived. "I thought about going on welfare," Cheri says, "but I decided to stick it out with Cousins."

And Cousins stuck with Cheri.

First they got her into a management training program, and later they paid for her tuition so she could start college.

Today, Cheri Dohse is a District Supervisor for Cousins and oversees seven restaurants. Her next goals are to own a Cousins franchise and to finish her college degree.

When she managed her own Cousins restaurant, Cheri worked with a lot of troubled neighborhood kids from broken homes—sometimes feeding them, sometimes counseling them.

The lesson Cheri tried to teach them is the lesson she learned—a job helps you climb higher. And once you start climbing, there's no telling how high you can go.

Cheri Dohse's story is extraordinary in many ways—but it's pretty typical in America's Restaurants. In fact, more than 69% of managers and owners began in entry-level, hourly jobs.



Wisconsin's Restaurants.
Good Jobs. Great People. Extraordinary Opportunity.

This message is proudly brought to you by the Wisconsin Restaurant Association
to celebrate the success stories in America's foodservice industry.

Robert J. Samuelson

Minimum Wage: Stale Symbolism

The debate over the minimum wage is an exercise in stale symbolism. The proposed increase—from the \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15—would not do much to help the poor. It might even hurt them. As such, the minimum wage is less about social policy than politics. Roughly three-quarters of Americans think raising it is the decent thing to do. So opponents are easily stigmatized as cruel. In an election year, this is a simple way for Democrats (who generally favor it) to embarrass Republicans (who don't).

If you doubt that, ponder some facts gathered by New York Times reporter David Rosenbaum. With computers, Rosenbaum had the official presidential papers—including presidential speeches, statements and press conferences—searched to find the number of times Clinton advocated a higher minimum wage in 1993 and 1994, when Democrats controlled Congress. The answer: zero. In 1995 and 1996, with Republicans controlling Congress, Clinton plugged a higher minimum 47 times (through March 11).

Public sympathy for a higher minimum rests on two false beliefs. The first is that there's a permanent group of workers always stuck at the minimum. It follows, then, that if the minimum isn't raised, their buying power constantly erodes to inflation. By this theory, we should find some fixed, irreducible share of workers (say, 5 percent) at the minimum.

Well, we don't. Even at the bottom of the wage scale, inflation and competition for workers gradually raise pay rates. Between 1981 and early 1990, the minimum wage remained at \$3.35. What happened? In 1981 there were 7.8 million workers at the minimum, or nearly 8 percent of 100 million workers. By 1989, only 3.2 million workers received the minimum, about 3 percent of the 117 million workers. If the minimum had stayed at \$3.35, almost no one would receive it now. In 1995 3.7 million workers were at the \$4.25 minimum, 3 percent of the 125 million workers.

The second myth is that many minimum-wage workers are family heads. In one press release, the Labor Department says that 40 percent of minimum-wage workers "are the sole breadwin-

ners of their family." The implication is that their low wages constitute an important source of poverty and hardship for children. Not so.

In justifying its statement, the Labor Department counts single people living by themselves as family heads—a definition that, though defensible, defies common sense. In 1995 only 28 percent of minimum-wage workers were married. Many were not in poverty, because the family had two earners. Others didn't have children. Obviously, some single parents earned the minimum wage. One study puts their number at about 3 percent of minimum-wage workers.

One familiar argument for a higher minimum is that a full-time worker at the minimum should have enough income to escape poverty. For singles, this is no problem. Someone working 40 hours a week at \$4.25 an hour earns \$8,840 a year, which is above the poverty line of \$7,900 for singles. But the Labor Department complains that a full-time worker with three dependents can't reach the poverty line of \$15,600.

This may be, but the Labor Department's example is hardly typical. Consider:

- Changes in the minimum don't affect most poor adults, because about 60 percent don't have jobs, and only about 10 percent have year-round, full-time jobs.

- Among minimum-wage workers in 1995, about three-quarters didn't work 40 hours a week. Most (55 percent) were part-timers, working less than 35 hours a week. (The share of part-timers was identical among those earning between \$4.25 and \$5.15 an hour.)

- Most minimum-wage workers aren't poor. In 1990, just before the last increase, about three-quarters came from families with incomes above the poverty line, estimates economist Richard Burkhauser of Syracuse University. About two-thirds had incomes at least 50 percent higher than the poverty line.

Most minimum-wage work consists of part-time, non-career jobs in fast food, retailing or even telemarketing. These jobs are filled heavily by young, single, often middle-class workers. In 1995 two-thirds of them were under 30; only 20 percent were over 40. Even the benefits of a

higher minimum for the poor are exaggerated. Take the Labor Department's family of four. With food stamps and the Earned Income Tax Credit, this family's income (\$14,766) is now only 5 percent below the poverty line. The higher minimum wage would, after changes in food stamps and the EITC, raise the family's income 2 percent above the poverty line—assuming the worker still had a job.

There's the catch. Higher wages, if artificially induced, may price some unskilled workers out of the market. True, some economic research questions whether modest increases in the minimum cause job loss. But this research has been harshly criticized, and most economists believe that every 10 percent rise in the minimum could erase between one percent and 2 percent of affected jobs. By this math, a \$5.15 minimum might jeopardize between 100,000 and 200,000 jobs among younger workers, estimates economist David Neumark of Michigan State University.

All exact estimates are suspect. Economists can't predict the precise effects of small changes in government policies. Because wages are rising anyway, a legislated increase may mainly affect the timing of future changes. At most, the poor might benefit slightly; at worst, they might suffer slightly. The real deception is that something important is being done when all that is occurring is a game of political one-upmanship.

The danger is that people will believe the deception. They will think that government can raise incomes by fiat, when most people advance through their own efforts and skills. If people accept the illusion, they will want bigger (and more damaging) increases in the minimum. Even economists who support the present proposal agree that increases to, say, \$6 or \$7 would cost jobs for the low-skilled. Because a low-paying job is often the best way to a high-paying job, that would be a huge step backward.

No matter. Our leaders are more comfortable with replaying ancient (and irrelevant) debates than facing present problems. These rituals are more than dishonest. They are a sign of political decadence.



Supporting the Efforts of Low Wage Working Americans

Raising the Minimum Wage Is Not the Answer

March 1996

It is an election year, and the parties are once again arguing over the minimum wage. Democrats are right that government has a critical role to play in helping people work their way out of poverty, in raising living standards, and in reducing inequality. Increasing the minimum wage, however, is the wrong strategy to promote these goals.

In 1989, the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) demonstrated that raising the minimum wage could be counterproductive, raising prices for poor people while helping mainly middle class families. Instead, PPI and the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) argued that Congress should reform the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to ensure that people who work full-time, year-round would be able to support their families above the poverty line. In 1990, and again in 1993, Congress expanded the EITC along the lines proposed by PPI, and Congress should reject calls to retreat from this commitment.

At the same time, there are ways to expand opportunities for low wage workers to work their way up the income scale. The key is to cut the deficit while investing in broader prosperity. Congress should repeal up to \$75 billion a year in unproductive industry spending and tax subsidies; the lion's share of these resources should be channeled to deficit reduction. The remainder could be dedicated to public investments to expand access to higher education, through the National Service program and the school-to-work initiative, and to skills enhancement through vouchers for retraining.

These approaches offer sound, market-based assistance for low income workers. By contrast, raising the minimum wage would be, at best, a blunt instrument.

- ▶ ***The vast majority of minimum wage workers are in families that do not need public wage supports because their incomes are well above the poverty level. Most minimum wage workers are not the sole support of low income families, but secondary workers in moderate or middle income families, or primary workers in families with other significant sources of income. Seventy percent of minimum wage workers are in families well above the poverty level, and nearly 40 percent are in families with incomes in the top half of the income distribution.***
- ▶ ***More than 75 percent of all poor Americans are ineligible for the minimum wage, and so would not benefit from an increase. They don't qualify because they (1) don't work (the elderly poor as well as the welfare poor), (2) earn more than an increased minimum wage (but work only part-time or part of the year), (3) work for themselves, or (4) work in jobs not covered by the minimum wage law.***

- ▶ *The costs of an increase in the minimum wage would be borne disproportionately by lower income families.* In the short run, a higher minimum wage raises costs and prices, transferring resources from consumers to minimum wage workers. There are some workers in low income families who would benefit significantly, but the vast majority of poor families would have to pay higher prices. Therefore, increasing the minimum wage would produce a regressive transfer, making most poor people a little worse off in order to improve the lives, at least for a time, of a group of people which is predominately non-poor.
- ▶ *A higher minimum wage does not protect jobs.* Some have argued that a higher minimum wage could protect jobs, because the higher wage would give firms an incentive to figure out how to use their minimum wage workers more productively. In effect, these analysts argue that higher wages yield higher productivity, rather than the reverse. There is no reliable empirical evidence to support this view.
- ▶ *In the end, raising the minimum wage would be self-defeating.* Firms initially respond to an increase in the minimum wage in the same way they respond to any increase in fixed costs affecting all competing firms: They will incorporate the cost in higher prices. This will tend to reduce jobs over a longer term, as higher prices reduce demand for the industry's goods and services. Raising the minimum wage will also mean that no firms will hire additional workers whose value to the firm falls between the old minimum wage and the new one. So in many cases, a higher minimum wage can reduce job creation for low skilled people.

*For these reasons, the Democratic Leadership Council and Progressive Policy Institute support other ways of helping low income workers. [The EITC—long supported by PPI and expanded by President Clinton in 1993—is a much better way of targeting benefits to low income working Americans.] For more information on the EITC, see *Work and Poverty: A Progressive View of the Minimum Wage and the Earned Income Tax Credit* (June 1989), and *An American Working Wage: Ending Poverty in Working Families* (February 1990), both by Robert J. Shapiro. We also support the use of vouchers for job training to replace the current system of more than 150 federal training programs—and other changes to empower workers—rather than burden business with additional rules and regulations.*

The EITC program is not perfect, but many recent criticisms of it are either exaggerated or plainly incorrect. In their quest to attain a balanced budget, many Republicans in Congress have recently been very critical of the EITC program and targeted it for significant reductions. This has occurred even though the program was started by President Ford and received its largest expansion under President Reagan. For more information on why recent criticisms are off the mark, see *GOP Cuts in the EITC: Raising Taxes on the Working Poor* (June 19, 1995) by M. Jeff Hamond and Lyn A. Hogan.

To order any of these publications, please contact our Publications Department at 1-800-546-0027 (in the Washington, DC metro area call, 202-544-6172), or visit our Web site at <http://www.dlcpqi.org/>.

ARMEY Packet

"THE MINIMUM WAGE FOR FAMILIES ACT"

LEGISLATIVE DESCRIPTION AND SUMMARY

This proposal will fundamentally redesign the EITC, and rename it the "Working Families Support Credit".

RATIONALE

It has become difficult in recent years to support a family on a minimum-wage salary. There is agreement among both Republicans and Democrats that we need to provide assistance to the "working poor", but there is significant disagreement on the best way to accomplish this goal.

The administration has proposed an increase in the minimum wage as the solution to this problem. While such an increase would provide some relief to the working poor, it would also have much more far reaching effects, including placing large economic constraints on the private sector, a loss of entry-level positions, and an inflationary ripple effect on wages. A minimum wage increase would also affect those persons who arguably are not in need of this assistance, such as teenagers working during their summer vacation.

Our proposal would accomplish the goal of providing assistance to those who are truly in need -- working families -- while at the same time avoiding the additional problems associated with a minimum wage increase.

BACKGROUND

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), which was created in 1974, provides a refundable tax credit to lower-income working families with children and currently to some adult childless workers. The EITC has expanded greatly since its creation as a result of both Congressional and Presidential initiatives, including efforts by the Reagan, Bush and Clinton administrations.

RECIPIENTS

Under current law, there are an estimated 18.2 million tax units eligible for EITC. 12.7 million of these tax units are families with children, of whom roughly 5.3 million have one child and 7.4 million have two or more children. The remaining 5.5 million eligible tax units are childless workers ages 25 through 64.

PROPOSAL

This EITC reform proposal, which builds upon the reforms in the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995, will redesign and reform the current EITC program in an effort to return the program to its original purpose of serving low-income working families. The proposal will address the following:

- * Convert large annual "lump sum" EITC payments into equal monthly payments so as to more practically supplement family income
- * Deny credit to undocumented workers
- * Eliminate credit for childless adults
- * Increase the support credit for parents
- * Rename Earned Income Tax Credit the "Working Families Support Credit"

With the savings generated from these reforms, we will significantly increase the amount of credit recipients of the Working Families Support Credit would receive.

If you believe that those people who are in need of wage assistance are America's working families, as opposed to teenagers employer during their summer vacation, please join us in support of The Minimum Wage Increase for Families Act.

If you would like to cosponsor this legislation or if you have additional questions, please contact Chuck Seyfarth with Representative Hutchinson at 5-4301.

There Are 153,900 Stories in Wisconsin's Restaurants. Here's a Great One.

Wisconsin's Success Stories

Cheri Dohse
Cousins Submarines

Cheri Dohse is one of the more than 153,900 people who work in Wisconsin's restaurants.

As a teenager, she started working for Cousins Submarines as a cashier. Her family needed the money and Cheri thought it would make for a nice temporary job.

But Cheri found she couldn't attend college, and then her son Michael arrived. "I thought about going on welfare," Cheri says, "but I decided to stick it out with Cousins."

And Cousins stuck with Cheri.

First they got her into a management training program, and later they paid for her tuition so she could start college.

Today Cheri Dohse is a District Supervisor for Cousins and oversees seven restaurants. Her next goals are to own a Cousins franchise and to finish her college degree.

When she managed her own Cousins restaurant, Cheri worked with a lot of troubled neighborhood kids from broken homes — sometimes feeding them, sometimes counseling them.

The lesson Cheri tried to teach them is the lesson she learned: "A job helps you climb higher. And once you start climbing, there's no telling how high you can go."

Cheri Dohse's story is extraordinary in many ways. But it's pretty typical in America's Restaurants. In fact, more than 60% of managers and owners began in entry-level, hourly jobs.



**Wisconsin's Restaurants.
Good Jobs. Great People. Extraordinary Opportunity.**

This message is proudly brought to you by the Wisconsin Restaurant Association
to celebrate the success stories in America's foodservice industry.

Robert J. Samuelson

Minimum Wage: Stale Symbolism

The debate over the minimum wage is an exercise in stale symbolism. The proposed increase—from the \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15—would not do much to help the poor. It might even hurt them. As such, the minimum wage is less about social policy than politics. Roughly three-quarters of Americans think raising it is the decent thing to do. So opponents are easily stigmatized as cruel. In an election year, this is a simple way for Democrats (who generally favor it) to embarrass Republicans (who don't).

If you doubt that, ponder some facts gathered by New York Times reporter David Rosenbaum. With computers, Rosenbaum had the official presidential papers—including presidential speeches, statements and press conferences—searched to find the number of times Clinton advocated a higher minimum wage in 1993 and 1994, when Democrats controlled Congress. The answer: zero. In 1995 and 1996, with Republicans controlling Congress, Clinton plugged a higher minimum 47 times (through March 11).

Public sympathy for a higher minimum rests on two false beliefs. The first is that there's a permanent group of workers always stuck at the minimum. It follows, then, that if the minimum isn't raised, their buying power constantly erodes to inflation. By this theory, we should find some fixed, irreducible share of workers (say, 5 percent) at the minimum.

Well, we don't. Even at the bottom of the wage scale, inflation and competition for workers gradually raise pay rates. Between 1981 and early 1990, the minimum wage remained at \$3.35. What happened? In 1981 there were 7.8 million workers at the minimum, or nearly 8 percent of 100 million workers. By 1989, only 3.2 million workers received the minimum, about 3 percent of the 117 million workers. If the minimum had stayed at \$3.35, almost no one would receive it now. In 1995 3.7 million workers were at the \$4.25 minimum, 3 percent of the 125 million workers.

The second myth is that many minimum-wage workers are family heads. In one press release, the Labor Department says that 40 percent of minimum-wage workers "are the sole breadwin-

ners of their family." The implication is that their low wages constitute an important source of poverty and hardship for children. Not so.

In January its statement, the Labor Department counts single people living by themselves as family heads—a definition that, though defensible, defies common sense. In 1995 only 28 percent of minimum-wage workers were married. Many were not in poverty, because the family had two earners. Others didn't have children. Obviously, some single parents earned the minimum wage. One study puts their number at about 3 percent of minimum-wage workers.

One familiar argument for a higher minimum is that a full-time worker at the minimum should have enough income to escape poverty. For singles, this is no problem. Someone working 40 hours a week at \$4.25 an hour earns \$8,840 a year, which is above the poverty line of \$7,900 for singles. But the Labor Department complains that a full-time worker with three dependents can't reach the poverty line of \$15,600.

This may be, but the Labor Department's example is hardly typical. Consider:

- Changes in the minimum don't affect most poor adults, because about 60 percent don't have jobs, and only about 10 percent have year-round, full-time jobs.

- Among minimum-wage workers in 1995, about three-quarters didn't work 40 hours a week. Most (55 percent) were part-timers, working less than 35 hours a week. (The share of part-timers was identical among those earning between \$4.25 and \$5.15 an hour.)

- Most minimum-wage workers aren't poor. In 1990, just before the last increase, about three-quarters came from families with incomes above the poverty line, estimates economist Richard Burkhauser of Syracuse University. About two-thirds had incomes at least 50 percent higher than the poverty line.

Most minimum-wage work consists of part-time, non-career jobs in fast food, retailing or even telemarketing. These jobs are filled heavily by young, single, often middle-class workers. In 1995 two-thirds of them were under 30; only 20 percent were over 40. Even the benefits of a

higher minimum for the poor are exaggerated. Take the Labor Department's family of four. With food stamps and the Earned Income Tax Credit, this family's income (\$14,766) is now only 5 percent below the poverty line. The higher minimum wage would, after changes in food stamps and the EITC, raise the family's income 2 percent above the poverty line—assuming the worker still had a job.

There's the catch. Higher wages, if artificially induced, may price some unskilled workers out of the market. True, some economic research questions whether modest increases in the minimum cause job loss. But this research has been harshly criticized, and most economists believe that every 10 percent rise in the minimum could erase between one percent and 2 percent of affected jobs. By this math, a \$5.15 minimum might jeopardize between 100,000 and 200,000 jobs among younger workers, estimates economist David Neumark of Michigan State University.

All exact estimates are suspect. Economists can't predict the precise effects of small changes in government policies. Because wages are rising anyway, a legislated increase may mainly affect the timing of future changes. At most, the poor might benefit slightly; at worst, they might suffer slightly. The real deception is that something important is being done when all that is occurring is a game of political one-upmanship.

The danger is that people will believe the deception. They will think that government can raise incomes by fiat, when most people advance through their own efforts and skills. If people accept the illusion, they will want bigger (and more damaging) increases in the minimum. Even economists who support the present proposal agree that increases to, say, \$6 or \$7 would cost jobs for the low-skilled. Because a low-paying job is often the best way to a high-paying job, that would be a huge step backward.

No matter. Our leaders are more comfortable with replaying ancient (and irrelevant) debates than facing present problems. These rituals are more than dishonest. They are a sign of political decadence.



Supporting the Efforts of Low Wage Working Americans

Raising the Minimum Wage Is Not the Answer

March 1996

It is an election year, and the parties are once again arguing over the minimum wage. Democrats are right that government has a critical role to play in helping people work their way out of poverty, in raising living standards, and in reducing inequality. Increasing the minimum wage, however, is the wrong strategy to promote these goals.

In 1989, the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) demonstrated that raising the minimum wage could be counterproductive, raising prices for poor people while helping mainly middle class families. Instead, PPI and the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) argued that Congress should reform the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to ensure that people who work full-time, year-round would be able to support their families above the poverty line. In 1990, and again in 1993, Congress expanded the EITC along the lines proposed by PPI, and Congress should reject calls to retreat from this commitment.

At the same time, there are ways to expand opportunities for low wage workers to work their way up the income scale. The key is to cut the deficit while investing in broader prosperity. Congress should repeal up to \$75 billion a year in unproductive industry spending and tax subsidies; the lion's share of these resources should be channeled to deficit reduction. The remainder could be dedicated to public investments to expand access to higher education, through the National Service program and the school-to-work initiative, and to skills enhancement through vouchers for retraining.

These approaches offer sound, market-based assistance for low income workers. By contrast, raising the minimum wage would be, at best, a blunt instrument.

- ▶ *The vast majority of minimum wage workers are in families that do not need public wage supports because their incomes are well above the poverty level. Most minimum wage workers are not the sole support of low income families, but secondary workers in moderate or middle income families, or primary workers in families with other significant sources of income. Seventy percent of minimum wage workers are in families well above the poverty level, and nearly 40 percent are in families with incomes in the top half of the income distribution.*
- ▶ *More than 75 percent of all poor Americans are ineligible for the minimum wage, and so would not benefit from an increase. They don't qualify because they (1) don't work (the elderly poor as well as the welfare poor), (2) earn more than an increased minimum wage (but work only part-time or part of the year), (3) work for themselves, or (4) work in jobs not covered by the minimum wage law.*

- ▶ *The costs of an increase in the minimum wage would be borne disproportionately by lower income families.* In the short run, a higher minimum wage raises costs and prices, transferring resources from consumers to minimum wage workers. There are some workers in low income families who would benefit significantly, but the vast majority of poor families would have to pay higher prices. Therefore, increasing the minimum wage would produce a regressive transfer, making most poor people a little worse off in order to improve the lives, at least for a time, of a group of people which is predominately non-poor.
- ▶ *A higher minimum wage does not protect jobs.* Some have argued that a higher minimum wage could protect jobs, because the higher wage would give firms an incentive to figure out how to use their minimum wage workers more productively. In effect, these analysts argue that higher wages yield higher productivity, rather than the reverse. There is no reliable empirical evidence to support this view.
- ▶ *In the end, raising the minimum wage would be self-defeating.* Firms initially respond to an increase in the minimum wage in the same way they respond to any increase in fixed costs affecting all competing firms: They will incorporate the cost in higher prices. This will tend to reduce jobs over a longer term, as higher prices reduce demand for the industry's goods and services. Raising the minimum wage will also mean that no firms will hire additional workers whose value to the firm falls between the old minimum wage and the new one. So in many cases, a higher minimum wage can reduce job creation for low skilled people.

*For these reasons, the Democratic Leadership Council and Progressive Policy Institute support other ways of helping low income workers. [The EITC—long supported by PPI and expanded by President Clinton in 1993—is a much better way of targeting benefits to low income working Americans.] For more information on the EITC, see *Work and Poverty: A Progressive View of the Minimum Wage and the Earned Income Tax Credit* (June 1989), and *An American Working Wage: Ending Poverty in Working Families* (February 1990), both by Robert J. Shapiro. We also support the use of vouchers for job training to replace the current system of more than 150 federal training programs—and other changes to empower workers—rather than burden business with additional rules and regulations.*

The EITC program is not perfect, but many recent criticisms of it are either exaggerated or plainly incorrect. In their quest to attain a balanced budget, many Republicans in Congress have recently been very critical of the EITC program and targeted it for significant reductions. This has occurred even though the program was started by President Ford and received its largest expansion under President Reagan. For more information on why recent criticisms are off the mark, see *GOP Cuts in the EITC: Raising Taxes on the Working Poor* (June 19, 1995) by M. Jeff Hamond and Lyn A. Hogan.

To order any of these publications, please contact our Publications Department at 1-800-546-0027 (in the Washington, DC metro area call, 202-544-6172), or visit our Web site at <http://www.dlcppi.org/>.

ARMEY Packet

"THE MINIMUM WAGE FOR FAMILIES ACT"

LEGISLATIVE DESCRIPTION AND SUMMARY

This proposal will fundamentally redesign the EITC, and rename it the "Working Families Support Credit".

RATIONALE

It has become difficult in recent years to support a family on a minimum-wage salary. There is agreement among both Republicans and Democrats that we need to provide assistance to the "working poor", but there is significant disagreement on the best way to accomplish this goal.

The administration has proposed an increase in the minimum wage as the solution to this problem. While such an increase would provide some relief to the working poor, it would also have much more far reaching effects, including placing large economic constraints on the private sector, a loss of entry-level positions, and an inflationary ripple effect on wages. A minimum wage increase would also affect those persons who arguably are not in need of this assistance, such as teenagers working during their summer vacation.

Our proposal would accomplish the goal of providing assistance to those who are truly in need -- working families -- while at the same time avoiding the additional problems associated with a minimum wage increase.

BACKGROUND

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), which was created in 1974, provides a refundable tax credit to lower-income working families with children and currently to some adult childless workers. The EITC has expanded greatly since its creation as a result of both Congressional and Presidential initiatives, including efforts by the Reagan, Bush and Clinton administrations.

RECIPIENTS

Under current law, there are an estimated 18.2 million tax units eligible for EITC. 12.7 million of these tax units are families with children, of whom roughly 5.3 million have one child and 7.4 million have two or more children. The remaining 5.5 million eligible tax units are childless workers ages 25 through 64.

PROPOSAL

This EITC reform proposal, which builds upon the reforms in the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995, will redesign and reform the current EITC program in an effort to return the program to its original purpose of serving low-income working families. The proposal will address the following:

- * Convert large annual "lump sum" EITC payments into equal monthly payments so as to more practically supplement family income
- * Deny credit to undocumented workers
- * Eliminate credit for childless adults
- * Increase the support credit for parents
- * Rename Earned Income Tax Credit the "Working Families Support Credit"

With the savings generated from these reforms, we will significantly increase the amount of credit recipients of the Working Families Support Credit would receive.

If you believe that those people who are in need of wage assistance are America's working families, as opposed to teenagers employer during their summer vacation, please join us in support of The Minimum Wage Increase for Families Act.

If you would like to cosponsor this legislation or if you have additional questions, please contact Chuck Seyfarth with Representative Hutchinson at 5-4301.

There Are 153,900 Stories in Wisconsin's Restaurants. Here's a Great One.

Wisconsin's Success Stories

Cheri Dohse
Cousins Submarines

Cheri Dohse is one of the more than 153,900 people who work in Wisconsin's restaurants.

As a teenager, she started working for Cousins Submarines as a cashier. Her family needed the money and Cheri thought it would make for a nice temporary job.

But Cheri found she couldn't afford college, and then her son Michael arrived. "I thought about going on welfare," Cheri says, "but I decided to stick it out with Cousins."

And Cousins stuck with Cheri.

First they got her into a management training program, and later they paid for her tuition so she could start college.

Today, Cheri Dohse is a District Supervisor for Cousins and oversees seven restaurants. Her next goals are to own a Cousins franchise and to finish her college degree.

When she managed her own Cousins restaurant, Cheri worked with a lot of troubled neighborhood kids from broken homes — sometimes feeding them, sometimes counseling them.

The lesson Cheri tried to teach them is the lesson she learned — a job helps you climb higher. And once you start climbing, there's no telling how high you can go.

Cheri Dohse's story is extraordinary in many ways, but it's pretty typical in America's Restaurants. In fact, more than 60% of managers and owners began in entry-level, hourly jobs.



**Wisconsin's Restaurants.
Good Jobs. Great People. Extraordinary Opportunity.**

This message is proudly brought to you by the Wisconsin Restaurant Association
to celebrate the success stories in America's foodservice industry.

Robert J. Samuelson

Minimum Wage: Stale Symbolism

The debate over the minimum wage is an exercise in stale symbolism. The proposed increase—from the \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15—would not do much to help the poor, and might even hurt them. As such, the minimum wage is less about social policy than politics. Roughly three-quarters of Americans think raising it is the decent thing to do. So opponents are easily stigmatized as cruel. In an election year, this is a simple way for Democrats (who generally favor it) to embarrass Republicans (who don't).

If you doubt that, ponder some facts gathered by New York Times reporter David Rosenbaum. With computers, Rosenbaum had the official presidential papers—including presidential speeches, statements and press conferences—searched to find the number of times Clinton advocated a higher minimum wage in 1993 and 1994, when Democrats controlled Congress. The answer: zero. In 1995 and 1996, with Republicans controlling Congress, Clinton plugged a higher minimum 47 times (through March 11).

Public sympathy for a higher minimum rests on two false beliefs. The first is that there's a permanent group of workers always stuck at the minimum. It follows, then, that if the minimum isn't raised, their buying power constantly erodes to inflation. By this theory, we should find some fixed, irreducible share of workers (say, 5 percent) at the minimum.

Well, we don't. Even at the bottom of the wage scale, inflation and competition for workers gradually raise pay rates. Between 1981 and early 1990, the minimum wage remained at \$3.35. What happened? In 1981 there were 7.8 million workers at the minimum, or nearly 8 percent of 100 million workers. By 1989, only 3.2 million workers received the minimum, about 3 percent of the 117 million workers. If the minimum had stayed at \$3.35, almost no one would receive it now. In 1995 3.7 million workers were at the \$4.25 minimum, 3 percent of the 125 million workers.

The second myth is that many minimum-wage workers are family heads. In one press release, the Labor Department says that 40 percent of minimum-wage workers "are the sole breadwin-

ners of their family." The implication is that their low wages constitute an important source of poverty and hardship for children. Not so.

To justify its statement, the Labor Department counts single people living by themselves as family heads—a definition that, though defensible, defies common sense. In 1995 only 28 percent of minimum-wage workers were married. Many were not in poverty, because the family had two earners. Others didn't have children. Obviously, some single parents earned the minimum wage. One study puts their number at about 3 percent of minimum-wage workers.

One familiar argument for a higher minimum is that a full-time worker at the minimum should have enough income to escape poverty. For singles, this is no problem. Someone working 40 hours a week at \$4.25 an hour earns \$8,840 a year, which is above the poverty line of \$7,900 for singles. But the Labor Department complains that a full-time worker with three dependents can't reach the poverty line of \$15,600.

This may be, but the Labor Department's example is hardly typical. Consider:

- Changes in the minimum don't affect most poor adults, because about 60 percent don't have jobs, and only about 10 percent have year-round, full-time jobs.

- Among minimum-wage workers in 1995, about three-quarters didn't work 40 hours a week. Most (55 percent) were part-timers, working less than 35 hours a week. (The share of part-timers was identical among those earning between \$4.25 and \$5.15 an hour.)

- Most minimum-wage workers aren't poor. In 1990, just before the last increase, about three-quarters came from families with incomes above the poverty line, estimates economist Richard Burkhauser of Syracuse University. About two-thirds had incomes at least 50 percent higher than the poverty line.

Most minimum-wage work consists of part-time, non-career jobs in fast food, retailing or even telemarketing. These jobs are filled heavily by young, single, often middle-class workers. In 1995 two-thirds of them were under 30; only 20 percent were over 40. Even the benefits of a

higher minimum for the poor are exaggerated. Take the Labor Department's family of four. With food stamps and the Earned Income Tax Credit, this family's income (\$14,766) is now only 5 percent below the poverty line. The higher minimum wage would, after changes in food stamps and the EITC, raise the family's income 2 percent above the poverty line—assuming the worker still had a job.

There's the catch. Higher wages, if artificially induced, may price some unskilled workers out of the market. True, some economic research questions whether modest increases in the minimum cause job loss. But this research has been harshly criticized, and most economists believe that every 10 percent rise in the minimum could erase between one percent and 2 percent of affected jobs. By this math, a \$5.15 minimum might jeopardize between 100,000 and 200,000 jobs among younger workers, estimates economist David Neumark of Michigan State University.

All exact estimates are suspect. Economists can't predict the precise effects of small changes in government policies. Because wages are rising anyway, a legislated increase may mainly affect the timing of future changes. At most, the poor might benefit slightly; at worst, they might suffer slightly. The real deception is that something important is being done when all that is occurring is a game of political one-upmanship.

The danger is that people will believe the deception. They will think that government can raise incomes by fiat, when most people advance through their own efforts and skills. If people accept the illusion, they will want bigger (and more damaging) increases in the minimum. Even economists who support the present proposal agree that increases to, say, \$6 or \$7 would cost jobs for the low-skilled. Because a low-paying job is often the best way to a high-paying job, that would be a huge step backward.

No matter. Our leaders are more comfortable with replaying ancient (and irrelevant) debates than facing present problems. These rituals are more than dishonest. They are a sign of political decadence.



Supporting the Efforts of Low Wage Working Americans

Raising the Minimum Wage Is Not the Answer

March 1996

It is an election year, and the parties are once again arguing over the minimum wage. Democrats are right that government has a critical role to play in helping people work their way out of poverty, in raising living standards, and in reducing inequality. Increasing the minimum wage, however, is the wrong strategy to promote these goals.

In 1989, the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) demonstrated that raising the minimum wage could be counterproductive, raising prices for poor people while helping mainly middle class families. Instead, PPI and the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) argued that Congress should reform the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to ensure that people who work full-time, year-round would be able to support their families above the poverty line. In 1990, and again in 1993, Congress expanded the EITC along the lines proposed by PPI, and Congress should reject calls to retreat from this commitment.

At the same time, there are ways to expand opportunities for low wage workers to work their way up the income scale. The key is to cut the deficit while investing in broader prosperity. Congress should repeal up to \$75 billion a year in unproductive industry spending and tax subsidies; the lion's share of these resources should be channeled to deficit reduction. The remainder could be dedicated to public investments to expand access to higher education, through the National Service program and the school-to-work Initiative, and to skills enhancement through vouchers for retraining.

These approaches offer sound, market-based assistance for low income workers. By contrast, raising the minimum wage would be, at best, a blunt instrument.

- ▶ *The vast majority of minimum wage workers are in families that do not need public wage supports because their incomes are well above the poverty level. Most minimum wage workers are not the sole support of low income families, but secondary workers in moderate or middle income families, or primary workers in families with other significant sources of income. Seventy percent of minimum wage workers are in families well above the poverty level, and nearly 40 percent are in families with incomes in the top half of the income distribution.*
- ▶ *More than 75 percent of all poor Americans are ineligible for the minimum wage, and so would not benefit from an increase. They don't qualify because they (1) don't work (the elderly poor as well as the welfare poor), (2) earn more than an increased minimum wage (but work only part-time or part of the year), (3) work for themselves, or (4) work in jobs not covered by the minimum wage law.*

- ▶ *The costs of an increase in the minimum wage would be borne disproportionately by lower income families.* In the short run, a higher minimum wage raises costs and prices, transferring resources from consumers to minimum wage workers. There are some workers in low income families who would benefit significantly, but the vast majority of poor families would have to pay higher prices. Therefore, increasing the minimum wage would produce a regressive transfer, making most poor people a little worse off in order to improve the lives, at least for a time, of a group of people which is predominately non-poor.
- ▶ *A higher minimum wage does not protect jobs.* Some have argued that a higher minimum wage could protect jobs, because the higher wage would give firms an incentive to figure out how to use their minimum wage workers more productively. In effect, these analysts argue that higher wages yield higher productivity, rather than the reverse. There is no reliable empirical evidence to support this view.
- ▶ *In the end, raising the minimum wage would be self-defeating.* Firms initially respond to an increase in the minimum wage in the same way they respond to any increase in fixed costs affecting all competing firms: They will incorporate the cost in higher prices. This will tend to reduce jobs over a longer term, as higher prices reduce demand for the industry's goods and services. Raising the minimum wage will also mean that no firms will hire additional workers whose value to the firm falls between the old minimum wage and the new one. So in many cases, a higher minimum wage can reduce job creation for low skilled people.

*For these reasons, the Democratic Leadership Council and Progressive Policy Institute support other ways of helping low income workers. The EITC—long supported by PPI and expanded by President Clinton in 1993—is a much better way of targeting benefits to low income working Americans. For more information on the EITC, see *Work and Poverty: A Progressive View of the Minimum Wage and the Earned Income Tax Credit* (June 1989), and *An American Working Wage: Ending Poverty in Working Families* (February 1990), both by Robert J. Shapiro. We also support the use of vouchers for job training to replace the current system of more than 150 federal training programs—and other changes to empower workers—rather than burden business with additional rules and regulations.*

The EITC program is not perfect, but many recent criticisms of it are either exaggerated or plainly incorrect. In their quest to attain a balanced budget, many Republicans in Congress have recently been very critical of the EITC program and targeted it for significant reductions. This has occurred even though the program was started by President Ford and received its largest expansion under President Reagan. For more information on why recent criticisms are off the mark, see *GOP Cuts in the EITC: Raising Taxes on the Working Poor* (June 19, 1995) by M. Jeff Hamond and Lyn A. Hogan.

To order any of these publications, please contact our Publications Department at 1-800-546-0027 (in the Washington, DC metro area call, 202-544-6172), or visit our Web site at <http://www.dlcppi.org/>.

ARMEY Packet

"THE MINIMUM WAGE FOR FAMILIES ACT"

LEGISLATIVE DESCRIPTION AND SUMMARY

This proposal will fundamentally redesign the EITC, and rename it the "Working Families Support Credit".

RATIONALE

It has become difficult in recent years to support a family on a minimum-wage salary. There is agreement among both Republicans and Democrats that we need to provide assistance to the "working poor", but there is significant disagreement on the best way to accomplish this goal.

The administration has proposed an increase in the minimum wage as the solution to this problem. While such an increase would provide some relief to the working poor, it would also have much more far reaching effects, including placing large economic constraints on the private sector, a loss of entry-level positions, and an inflationary ripple effect on wages. A minimum wage increase would also affect those persons who arguably are not in need of this assistance, such as teenagers working during their summer vacation.

Our proposal would accomplish the goal of providing assistance to those who are truly in need -- working families -- while at the same time avoiding the additional problems associated with a minimum wage increase.

BACKGROUND

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), which was created in 1974, provides a refundable tax credit to lower-income working families with children and currently to some adult childless workers. The EITC has expanded greatly since its creation as a result of both Congressional and Presidential initiatives, including efforts by the Reagan, Bush and Clinton administrations.

RECIPIENTS

Under current law, there are an estimated 18.2 million tax units eligible for EITC. 12.7 million of these tax units are families with children, of whom roughly 5.3 million have one child and 7.4 million have two or more children. The remaining 5.5 million eligible tax units are childless workers ages 25 through 64.

PROPOSAL

This EITC reform proposal, which builds upon the reforms in the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995, will redesign and reform the current EITC program in an effort to return the program to its original purpose of serving low-income working families. The proposal will address the following:

- * Convert large annual "lump sum" EITC payments into equal monthly payments so as to more practically supplement family income
- * Deny credit to undocumented workers
- * Eliminate credit for childless adults
- * Increase the support credit for parents
- * Rename Earned Income Tax Credit the "Working Families Support Credit"

With the savings generated from these reforms, we will significantly increase the amount of credit recipients of the Working Families Support Credit would receive.

If you believe that those people who are in need of wage assistance are America's working families, as opposed to teenagers employer during their summer vacation, please join us in support of The Minimum Wage Increase for Families Act.

If you would like to cosponsor this legislation or if you have additional questions, please contact Chuck Seyfarth with Representative Hutchinson at 5-4301.

There Are 153,900 Stories in Wisconsin's Restaurants. Here's a Great One.

Wisconsin's Success Stories

Cheri Dohse
Cousins Submarines

Cheri Dohse is one of the more than 153,900 people who work in Wisconsin's restaurants.

As a teenager, she started working for Cousins Submarines as a cashier. Her family needed the money and Cheri thought it would make for a nice temporary job.

But Cheri found she couldn't attend college, and then her son Michael arrived. "I thought about going on welfare," Cheri says, "but I decided to stick it out with Cousins."

And Cousins stuck with Cheri.

First they got her into a management training program, and later they paid for her tuition so she could start college.

Today, Cheri Dohse is a District Supervisor for Cousins and oversees seven restaurants. Her next goals are to own a Cousins franchise and to finish her college degree.

When she managed her own Cousins restaurant, Cheri worked with a lot of troubled neighborhood kids from broken homes — sometimes feeding them, sometimes counseling them.

The lesson Cheri tried to teach them is the lesson she learned: a job helps you climb higher. And once you start climbing, there's no telling how high you can go.

Cheri Dohse's story is extraordinary in many ways, but it's pretty typical in America's Restaurants. In fact, more than 40% of managers and owners began in entry level, hourly jobs.



**Wisconsin's Restaurants.
Good Jobs. Great People. Extraordinary Opportunity.**

This message is proudly brought to you by the Wisconsin Restaurant Association
to celebrate the success stories in America's foodservice industry.

Robert J. Samuelson

Minimum Wage: Stale Symbolism

The debate over the minimum wage is an exercise in stale symbolism. The proposed increase—from the \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15—would not do much to help the poor. It might even hurt them. As such, the minimum wage is less about social policy than politics. Roughly three-quarters of Americans think raising it is the decent thing to do. So opponents are easily stigmatized as cruel. In an election year, this is a simple way for Democrats (who generally favor it) to embarrass Republicans (who don't).

If you doubt that, ponder some facts gathered by New York Times reporter David Rosenbaum. With computers, Rosenbaum had the official presidential papers—including presidential speeches, statements and press conferences—searched to find the number of times Clinton advocated a higher minimum wage in 1993 and 1994, when Democrats controlled Congress. The answer: zero. In 1995 and 1996, with Republicans controlling Congress, Clinton plugged a higher minimum 47 times (through March 11).

Public sympathy for a higher minimum rests on two false beliefs. The first is that there's a permanent group of workers always stuck at the minimum. It follows, then, that if the minimum isn't raised, their buying power constantly erodes to inflation. By this theory, we should find some fixed, irreducible share of workers (say, 5 percent) at the minimum.

Well, we don't. Even at the bottom of the wage scale, inflation and competition for workers gradually raise pay rates. Between 1981 and early 1990, the minimum wage remained at \$3.35. What happened? In 1981 there were 7.8 million workers at the minimum, or nearly 8 percent of 100 million workers. By 1989, only 3.2 million workers received the minimum, about 3 percent of the 117 million workers. If the minimum had stayed at \$3.35, almost no one would receive it now. In 1995 3.7 million workers were at the \$4.25 minimum, 3 percent of the 125 million workers.

The second myth is that many minimum-wage workers are family heads. In one press release, the Labor Department says that 40 percent of minimum-wage workers "are the sole breadwin-

ners of their family." The implication is that their low wages constitute an important source of poverty and hardship for children. Not so.

In reality, as stated, the Labor Department counts single people living by themselves as family heads—a definition that, though defensible, defies common sense. In 1995 only 28 percent of minimum-wage workers were married. Many were not in poverty, because the family had two earners. Others didn't have children. Obviously, some single parents earned the minimum wage. One study puts their number at about 3 percent of minimum-wage workers.

One familiar argument for a higher minimum is that a full-time worker at the minimum should have enough income to escape poverty. For singles, this is no problem. Someone working 40 hours a week at \$4.25 an hour earns \$8,840 a year, which is above the poverty line of \$7,900 for singles. But the Labor Department complains that a full-time worker with three dependents can't reach the poverty line of \$15,600.

This may be, but the Labor Department's example is hardly typical. Consider:

- Changes in the minimum don't affect most poor adults, because about 60 percent don't have jobs, and only about 10 percent have year-round, full-time jobs.

- Among minimum-wage workers in 1995, about three-quarters didn't work 40 hours a week. Most (55 percent) were part-timers, working less than 35 hours a week. (The share of part-timers was identical among those earning between \$4.25 and \$5.15 an hour.)

- Most minimum-wage workers aren't poor. In 1990, just before the last increase, about three-quarters came from families with incomes above the poverty line, estimates economist Richard Burkhauser of Syracuse University. About two-thirds had incomes at least 50 percent higher than the poverty line.

Most minimum-wage work consists of part-time, non-career jobs in fast food, retailing or even telemarketing. These jobs are filled heavily by young, single, often middle-class workers. In 1995 two-thirds of them were under 30; only 20 percent were over 40. Even the benefits of a

higher minimum for the poor are exaggerated. Take the Labor Department's family of four. With food stamps and the Earned Income Tax Credit, this family's income (\$14,766) is now only 5 percent below the poverty line. The higher minimum wage would, after changes in food stamps and the EITC, raise the family's income 2 percent above the poverty line—assuming the worker still had a job.

There's the catch. Higher wages, if artificially induced, may price some unskilled workers out of the market. True, some economic research questions whether modest increases in the minimum cause job loss. But this research has been harshly criticized, and most economists believe that every 10 percent rise in the minimum could erase between one percent and 2 percent of affected jobs. By this math, a \$5.15 minimum might jeopardize between 100,000 and 200,000 jobs among younger workers, estimates economist David Neumark of Michigan State University.

All exact estimates are suspect. Economists can't predict the precise effects of small changes in government policies. Because wages are rising anyway, a legislated increase may mainly affect the timing of future changes. At most, the poor might benefit slightly; at worst, they might suffer slightly. The real deception is that something important is being done when all that is occurring is a game of political one-upmanship.

The danger is that people will believe the deception. They will think that government can raise incomes by fiat, when most people advance through their own efforts and skills. If people accept the illusion, they will want bigger (and more damaging) increases in the minimum. Even economists who support the present proposal agree that increases to, say, \$6 or \$7 would cost jobs for the low-skilled. Because a low-paying job is often the best way to a high-paying job, that would be a huge step backward.

No matter. Our leaders are more comfortable with replaying ancient (and irrelevant) debates than facing present problems. These rituals are more than dishonest. They are a sign of political decadence.



Supporting the Efforts of Low Wage Working Americans

Raising the Minimum Wage Is Not the Answer

March 1996

It is an election year, and the parties are once again arguing over the minimum wage. Democrats are right that government has a critical role to play in helping people work their way out of poverty, in raising living standards, and in reducing inequality. Increasing the minimum wage, however, is the wrong strategy to promote these goals.

In 1989, the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) demonstrated that raising the minimum wage could be counterproductive, raising prices for poor people while helping mainly middle class families. Instead, PPI and the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) argued that Congress should reform the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to ensure that people who work full-time, year-round would be able to support their families above the poverty line. In 1990, and again in 1993, Congress expanded the EITC along the lines proposed by PPI, and Congress should reject calls to retreat from this commitment.

At the same time, there are ways to expand opportunities for low wage workers to work their way up the income scale. The key is to cut the deficit while investing in broader prosperity. Congress should repeal up to \$75 billion a year in unproductive industry spending and tax subsidies; the lion's share of these resources should be channeled to deficit reduction. The remainder could be dedicated to public investments to expand access to higher education, through the National Service program and the school-to-work initiative, and to skills enhancement through vouchers for retraining.

These approaches offer sound, market-based assistance for low income workers. By contrast, raising the minimum wage would be, at best, a blunt instrument.

- ▶ *The vast majority of minimum wage workers are in families that do not need public wage supports because their incomes are well above the poverty level.* Most minimum wage workers are not the sole support of low income families, but secondary workers in moderate or middle income families, or primary workers in families with other significant sources of income. Seventy percent of minimum wage workers are in families well above the poverty level, and nearly 40 percent are in families with incomes in the top half of the income distribution.
- ▶ *More than 75 percent of all poor Americans are ineligible for the minimum wage, and so would not benefit from an increase.* They don't qualify because they (1) don't work (the elderly poor as well as the welfare poor), (2) earn more than an increased minimum wage (but work only part-time or part of the year), (3) work for themselves, or (4) work in jobs not covered by the minimum wage law.

- ▶ *The costs of an increase in the minimum wage would be borne disproportionately by lower income families.* In the short run, a higher minimum wage raises costs and prices, transferring resources from consumers to minimum wage workers. There are some workers in low income families who would benefit significantly, but the vast majority of poor families would have to pay higher prices. Therefore, increasing the minimum wage would produce a regressive transfer, making most poor people a little worse off in order to improve the lives, at least for a time, of a group of people which is predominately non-poor.
- ▶ *A higher minimum wage does not protect jobs.* Some have argued that a higher minimum wage could protect jobs, because the higher wage would give firms an incentive to figure out how to use their minimum wage workers more productively. In effect, these analysts argue that higher wages yield higher productivity, rather than the reverse. There is no reliable empirical evidence to support this view.
- ▶ *In the end, raising the minimum wage would be self-defeating.* Firms initially respond to an increase in the minimum wage in the same way they respond to any increase in fixed costs affecting all competing firms: They will incorporate the cost in higher prices. This will tend to reduce jobs over a longer term, as higher prices reduce demand for the industry's goods and services. Raising the minimum wage will also mean that no firms will hire additional workers whose value to the firm falls between the old minimum wage and the new one. So in many cases, a higher minimum wage can reduce job creation for low skilled people.

*For these reasons, the Democratic Leadership Council and Progressive Policy Institute support other ways of helping low income workers. [The EITC—long supported by PPI and expanded by President Clinton in 1993—is a much better way of targeting benefits to low income working Americans.] For more information on the EITC, see *Work and Poverty: A Progressive View of the Minimum Wage and the Earned Income Tax Credit* (June 1989), and *An American Working Wage: Ending Poverty in Working Families* (February 1990), both by Robert J. Shapiro. We also support the use of vouchers for job training to replace the current system of more than 150 federal training programs—and other changes to empower workers—rather than burden business with additional rules and regulations.*

The EITC program is not perfect, but many recent criticisms of it are either exaggerated or plainly incorrect. In their quest to attain a balanced budget, many Republicans in Congress have recently been very critical of the EITC program and targeted it for significant reductions. This has occurred even though the program was started by President Ford and received its largest expansion under President Reagan. For more information on why recent criticisms are off the mark, see *GOP Cuts in the EITC: Raising Taxes on the Working Poor* (June 19, 1995) by M. Jeff Hamond and Lyn A. Hogan.

To order any of these publications, please contact our Publications Department at 1-800-546-0027 (in the Washington, DC metro area call, 202-544-6172), or visit our Web site at <http://www.dlcppi.org/>.