

Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

# Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-04/msg04143.html>

---

- *From:* MooseFET <kensmith@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sat, 26 Apr 2008 06:20:55 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Apr 25, 7:25 pm, James Arthur <bogusabd...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Joel Koltner wrote:

Hi James,

"James Arthur" <bogusabd...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:XEoQj.42\\$TS5.4@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:XEoQj.42$TS5.4@xxxxxxxxxxxx)

When he did get a minimum wage job, local "living wage"  
rules meant the kid  
earned enough to raise a small family, for bagging groceries.  
No wonder  
they can't afford to hire many workers!

Rather than eliminating minimum wage laws, a better approach might be to  
expand the "farm worker" laws to encompass more people? It's a hard  
question — while obviously most teens are living with their parents who are  
supported by them, there certainly are older teens out there supporting  
themselves largely or completely independently from their parents and as just  
as "deserving" of the minimum wage as, e.g., some 40-year-old is.

Or maybe we just need to make it easier for teens to declare themselves as  
independents: In college a few kids did that because they didn't qualify for  
student loans or grants based on the buckets of money their parents had, yet  
said parents weren't volunteering any of it to help the kid put himself  
through school either.

Too many exceptions. Why not just let people work for whatever it is  
they're willing to work for?

Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

How about:  
because it leads to most people being in poverty and a few being very rich.

Why not encourage retirees to get out  
and make some pocket change, and contribute to their health & society  
even if they don't need the money?

How about:  
because we will all be old some day and we don't want to die in  
poverty.

Ditto for teens, or well-kept  
housemates.

Mr. Adam Smith assured us long ago that it's quite impossible to work  
long for less than a living wage.

Lots of people said lots of things long ago. I remember a book called  
Mother Goose was written long ago.

[And it is, unless you introduce subsidies. Subsidized people  
are willing to work for less because they can—it then makes  
sense for them, with taxpayers footing the balance. Subsidies  
drive down wages. But, then, they're still living wages.]

Only if you define "living wage" as just enough to afford the food to  
get the strength to work another day.

So I don't really see the need for a minimum wage—it just restricts  
employment, the training of future generations, and many who would  
otherwise contribute.

Oh, and, of course, results in the export of low-valued work that could  
be done here.

The high value work is being exported when that work involves

Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

information. The burger flipping job can't leave. We will end up a nation of burger flippers and all of the banking and computer science and engineering will be elsewhere.

Cheers,  
James Arthur