

## **QUESTION NO. 6**

### **Amendment to the Nevada Constitution**

#### **CONDENSATION (ballot question)**

**Shall the Nevada Constitution be amended to raise the minimum wage paid to employees?**

#### **EXPLANATION**

The proposed amendment, if passed, would create a new section to Article 15 of the Nevada Constitution. The amendment would require employers to pay Nevada employees \$5.15 per hour worked if the employer provides health benefits, or \$6.15 per hour worked if the employer does not provide health benefits. The rates shall be adjusted by the amount of increases in the federal minimum wage over \$5.15 per hour, or, if greater, by the cumulative increase in the cost of living measured by the Consumer Price Index (CPI), with no CPI adjustment for any one-year period greater than 3%.

#### **ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF QUESTION NO. 6**

All Nevadans will benefit from a long-overdue increase in the state's minimum wage through a more robust economy, a decreased taxpayer burden and stronger families.

Low-income workers who do not currently earn enough to cover the basic costs of living for their families – housing, health care, food and child care – will clearly benefit. Many low-income Nevada families live in poverty even though they have full-time jobs. A Nevada worker at the current minimum wage for 40 hours per-week — every week, all year – makes only \$10,712. If the minimum wage had been increased to keep up with rising prices over the last 25 years, it would now bring in \$15,431 per-year – not \$10,712. At the current \$5.15 an hour, many minimum wage workers in Nevada have incomes below the federal poverty line. We want to encourage people to work and be productive members of society. It's economic common sense.

Taxpayers will benefit as an increased minimum wage allows low-income working families to become more financially able to free themselves from costly taxpayer-provided services such as welfare, childcare and public health services.

Our state's economy will benefit as we develop a workforce that will earn more spendable income and put dollars directly into local stores and businesses.

Raising the minimum wage one dollar affirms Nevadan's beliefs that we value work, especially the difficult jobs performed by nursing home employees, childcare workers, and restaurant employees.

Minimum wage workers are not just teenagers working part-time to pay for movies, CDs and fast food. The vast majority of minimum wage workers in Nevada are adults (79% are 20 and older). Most work full-time. Six out of 10 minimum wage earners are women. Twenty-five percent are single mothers. And altogether they are the parents of 25,000 children. The paycheck these workers bring home accounts for about half of their families' earnings.

No matter what special interests and big corporations who oppose a fair minimum wage tell you, virtually *every* reputable economic study has found that workers don't get fired when minimum wages are passed or increased. In fact, employment increases. Eight of the eleven states that had a minimum wage above the federal level in 2003 are producing more jobs than the United States as a whole.

Raising the minimum wage makes sense for *all* of Nevada. Cast a vote for Nevada working people, Nevada taxpayers, Nevada values and a stronger Nevada economy.

### **REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF QUESTION NO. 6**

Contrary to claims by those eager to change Nevada's constitution, the most credible economic research for over 30 years has shown that minimum wage hikes hurt, rather than help, low-wage workers.

A recent example is the study, *The Effects of Minimum Wages Throughout the Wage Distribution*, by David Neumark, National Bureau of Economic Research; Mark Schweitzer, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; and William Wascher, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve - Division of Research and Statistics: "The evidence indicates that workers initially earning near the minimum wage are adversely affected by minimum wage increases.... Although wages of low-wage workers increase, their hours and employment decline, and the combined effect of these changes is a decline in earned income." *National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 7519, 5/8/2000.*

The same year, Stanford University's Thomas MaCurdy & Frank McIntyre showed that the effect of a minimum wage increase is very similar to a "sales tax levied only on selective commodities" and conclude: "... three in four of the poorest workers *lose* from shouldering the costs of higher prices resulting from the wage increase. When these benefits and costs are considered, the minimum wage is *ineffective* as an anti-poverty policy."

### **ARGUMENT AGAINST QUESTION NO. 6**

This constitutional amendment would actually *increase* poverty in Nevada, rather than fight it.

Suffering the most would be single mothers with little education, and other unskilled workers who are just entering the job market.

Today, such entry-level employees are paid not just with wages, but also the chance to learn new job skills. With those new skills—and the work habits they learn—they are able to climb the job ladder and make better lives for themselves and their families.

But if government forces entry-level wages artificially higher, fewer businesses will be able to hire these unskilled workers. That's because their *total* cost to the company—their pay, plus their training costs—will often be greater than these workers contribute to the company. So some workers will be let go, and others will never be hired.

Nevada has long been known as a state where businesses enjoy economic opportunities they cannot find elsewhere. But this constitutional amendment would end all that.

It would suddenly place Nevada at a big economic disadvantage to many other states—states without these high wage requirements. Under this amendment, wages paid in Nevada must, from now on, exceed the federal minimum wage by about \$1 an hour. This would seriously damage Nevada businesses—especially small mom and pop businesses, which usually have fewer resources to work with.

This proposal also would discriminate against non-union companies—which means against the great majority of small businesses in Nevada. It would give labor union officials the power, under the law, to permit *union* companies to hire new employees at rates *below* the new minimum wage. This is unfair to both companies and union members. It is also a virtual invitation to union corruption.

The key to fighting poverty—and to achieving higher wages for *all* workers—is long-term economic growth. Artificially higher wages imposed by government will only obstruct such growth.

This proposed constitutional amendment should be rejected.

Fiscal impact: Negative.

Environmental impact: Neutral.

Public health, safety and welfare impact: Negative.

### **REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST QUESTION NO. 6**

Raising the minimum wage in Nevada will decrease poverty as it increases people's participation in the State's economy. If increased wages actually made people poorer – as the special interests opposed to this amendment ridiculously claim – *nobody* in Nevada would ever ask for a raise.

Single mothers, as well as anyone else working a minimum wage job, will see an increase in their wages that will actually allow them to pay for housing, healthcare, food and childcare.

All available economic studies show that *everyone* wins when the minimum wage is increased. Low-income workers earn more, become less dependent on welfare and other public programs which eases the burden on taxpayers, and have more money to spend on local goods and services -- which strengthens the economy and generates more jobs.

There is *nothing* in the amendment to raise the minimum wage that would exempt union companies – it's a federal minimum that all companies must follow.

Raise low-income workers' wage. Spur Nevada's economic growth. Generate more buying power to support Nevada businesses. Create jobs. Move low-wage workers away from dependence on public programs and ease taxpayers' burden.

You can achieve *all* of these goals by voting YES on the minimum wage amendment.

### **FISCAL NOTE**

#### **Financial Impact – Cannot be determined.**

Although the proposal to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to increase the minimum wage in Nevada could result in additional costs to Nevada's businesses, the impact on a particular business would depend on the number of employees working at a wage below the new requirement, the amount by which the wages would need to be increased and any actions taken by the business to offset any increased costs associated with the increased wage requirement.

The proposal would, however, result in beneficial financial impacts for employees who receive a wage increase as a result of the proposal and who are not impacted adversely by any actions taken by the business to offset the increased costs associated with the increased wage requirement.

In addition, if the proposal results in an increase in annual wages paid by Nevada's employers, revenues received by the State from the imposition of the Modified Business Tax would also increase.