

Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-04/msg04382.html>

- *From:* MooseFET <kensmith@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 28 Apr 2008 06:19:08 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Apr 27, 7:42 pm, James Arthur <dagmargoodb...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 26, 6:20 am, MooseFET <kensm...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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

Joel Koltner wrote:

Hi James,

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

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

Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

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?

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

Hmm, so the existence of any minimum wage—natural or enforced—means that all wages are driven to that minimum, and we're all working for it as we speak.

No that is not what I said. I suggested that the reason to have a minimum wage was to prevent the majority of people from being forced into poverty.

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?

Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

Re: Oh my Gawd! Carly!

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

Allowing older folks to participate, earn & contribute condemns them
to poverty? I see your point.

Better to prevent them from working, then make up the difference with
government money—it's free, after all.

It isn't free but wouldn't you agree it is worth the cost if it
prevents us from all dieing in poverty.

Grins,
James Arthur