

The Rush Limbaugh Show April 7, 2005

BEGIN TRANSCRIPT

RUSH: I want to turn back the hands of time just a few hours to today's Morning Update. For those of you that did not have a chance to catch today's morning update on your local EIB affiliate, I want to share the substance of the update with you. "Lawmakers in Maryland..." These are actually extremist lawmakers. They have crafted legislation that is practically guaranteed to lose jobs in the state of Maryland. Here we have the Democrats want to talk about how the economy "is going south, gas prices are going up, people can't make ends meet," blah, blah and the liberal lawmakers in Maryland put together a piece of legislation that ought to ensure job losses. You talk about a bill for one person? "We can't do the Schiavo bill, one person? The bill in Maryland would force one company, Wal-Mart, "to either spend 8% of their payroll on health benefits for their employees or hand over the money to the state's health care program for the poor. State senator and finance committee chairman Thomas Middleton, a Democrat [of course] said, 'We're looking for responsible businesses to ante up and provide adequate health care.'" Responsible businesses to ante up and provide adequate health care?

Now, the bill does not mention Wal-Mart. They're not that stupid. They don't target Wal-Mart by name, and these legislators -- you can also call them extortionists -- they said their aim was *not* to single out Wal-Mart, but strangely enough their bill is only applicable to businesses with more than 10,000 employees. Well... Wal-Mart is the only company in the state of Maryland so affected. They have 15,000 employees in the state, and so Wal-Mart is the only company that will be affected by this new extortion that demands 8% of their payroll on health benefits for their employees. Now, the governor there, Robert Ehrlich is expected to veto this but the Democrats have the votes needed to override this veto. Remember something else, too, folks. Last week 21 Democrats in the US Congress joined a union effort demanding that ABC News drop Wal-Mart as a sponsor. So it seems to me that Democratic legislators in Maryland and some in the US Congress are targeting an American corporation: Wal-Mart. One reason they're not unionized. One reason: "They're not paying enough health benefits to people. We're going to go get 8% of their payroll in health benefits and if they don't pay it to the employees they're going to pay it to us in the state of Maryland." So once again, liberal Democrats in Maryland think they know better than Wal-Mart executives how to run the company. And in my morning update I suggested a solution to Wal-Mart for this.

I think what Wal-Mart ought to do is just close a few stores in the state, and move them, right over the border, neighborhood states. Just close enough stores to where they could take five thousand and *one* jobs, make the number of employees in the state of Maryland under 5,000 and not be subject to the provisions of the legislation. I don't know if that would ever happen but that's one of the things I would love to see, and maybe you need to take more than 5,001 because you're going to be hiring people. Wal-Mart hires people, so you maybe take 7,500 jobs out of state to leave yourself room to hire more people in Maryland, because that's what Wal-Mart does, they hire people. I fully expect then the legislation would be amended to include businesses of *whatever* number of employees that Wal-Mart has. The problem there might result -- they'd be targeting a bunch of Democrat-run businesses and they might have some problems. But the real message of this is: *If you are a large or rapidly growing business, stay out of Maryland.* As long as socialist Democrats are in charge of the State legislature there, you are not going to have the freedom to run your business as you see fit. They're gonna tell you what you must do to be, quote, unquote, a good moral citizen, and you have no choice. Pack up and leave or pay the freight. So that's it. Here's something else. Step two in Maryland, job killer story number two. "The Maryland state Senate has voted to increase Maryland's minimum wage by a buck up to \$6.15 an hour. The vote largely followed party lines. Republicans opposed the bill saying that small businesses won't be able to afford the increase. The bill already passed the House of Delegates now goes to Governor Ehrlich whose response here is uncertain."

So after we've killed a bunch of jobs with the Wal-Mart bill, now we're going to kill even more jobs because we're going to raise the minimum wage a buck. I know a lot of you people, "How

could that kill jobs?" Small businesses, folks, have a certain amount of money allocated in their budget for payroll. It's the #1 expense for all businesses, and that is just not an infinitely large pile of money, and it doesn't just grow, and they don't just have piles of money around they're not *using* to wait for legislators to come along and tell them how to spend it. So if you've got X budgeted for labor, and a certain percentage of that is entry-level labor at the minimum wage, if the price goes up, you're going to have to fire some people in order to keep your budget in line. You don't give everybody a raise and then keep hiring people when you've got a set amount. It depends on a whole bunch of factors. None of these factors matter to the Democrats or the liberals -- and that's how it kills jobs, and that's just one of the ways it kills jobs. So two job-killer bills back-to-back. The state of Maryland, not the place to go if you are a business that sees vast growth and expansion in your future.

BREAK TRANSCRIPT

RUSH: One more thing about this Wal-Mart story that's a little interesting. The aspect of the Wal-Mart story involving the 21 legislators and union members who banded together, US congressmen, who banded together to bash Wal-Mart because it was nonunion? A number of these union thugs that showed up to protest were shouting Hillary's name and so forth. Hillary Clinton used to be *on the board of directors at Wal-Mart* for six years when she and her husband lived in Arkansas. When she was the first lady of Arkansas, she was on the Wal-Mart board of directors, and now she is seen as one who has sided with the unions who hate Wal-Mart, against Wal-Mart -- despite having been on their board and having done nothing about their union practices while she was on the board. When she was on the board at Wal-Mart she probably didn't raise her voice once about Wal-Mart's hiring practices or health care benefit structure or anything else. But now that she's in the US Senate? You know what it's kind of like? It's kind of like Democrats that are pro-life then they decide they want a national career and they gotta immediately become pro-choice to get the feminazi vote. So here's Hillary, she's a first lady of Arkansas, she's on the Wal-Mart board for six years, doesn't say a *peep* about their business practices, becomes a US senator from New York and is cheered by union thugs for opposing Wal-Mart's union stance or anti-union stance or what have you.

BREAK TRANSCRIPT

RUSH: Here's Jill in Cleveland. It's great to have you on the program, Jill, welcome.

CALLER: Hello, Rush. It's great to talk to you.

RUSH: Thank you.

CALLER: I have just a quick question. I'm surrounded by lots of liberal friends here in Cleveland.

RUSH: Yes.

CALLER: And the question I had about Wal-Mart is, if it's true that most of their workers are part time and they're not providing health benefits, therefore, these people, doesn't the state have the right to try and recoup these costs from Wal-Mart?

RUSH: Well, the premise of your question is wrong but for the sake of answering you I'm going to accept the premise of your question. First place most of their employees are *not* part time; most of their employees are *not* under 40 hours, but it is true around the country that many businesses who hire part-timers -- people that work less than 40 hours -- do not pay health care benefits for them. It's *not* just Wal-Mart. But let's accept the premise of your story that more of their workforce is part time than full time. Why in the world -- what was your question? Does the state have the right to recoup the costs? What costs?

CALLER: Well, they're drawing down on Medicaid and they're drawing down on some of these social services that theoretically -- that people tell me, you know -- that if they were getting all these benefits because they were full time, then they wouldn't have to use any of these entitlements.

RUSH: Wait, I'm getting confused. *Medicaid* and other social services have what to do with

Wal-Mart health care benefits?

CALLER: Oh, well, maybe I'm using the wrong term.

RUSH: No. You may be using the wrong term but it illustrates how the issue has been distorted, demagogued, and confused. Medicaid and Medicare have nothing to do with it. They've got their own taxes, and part-time people pay them!

CALLER: Right. Right --

RUSH: It has nothing to do with health care benefits from Wal-Mart. But so a company doesn't provide health care benefits. You think that entitles the state to somehow come up with legislation to recoup, quote, unquote, the costs?

CALLER: Well, see, Wal-Mart --

RUSH: Whose costs?

CALLER: -- was just prevented from coming here in Cleveland, and this is why it's a big argument because there's a vacant steelyard that would have been great.

RUSH: I'm going to tell you that, to me is a bogus argument. They're afraid of Wal-Mart for other reasons. They don't like Wal-Mart, #1, because Wal-Mart contributes to Republican causes.

CALLER: Right.

RUSH: That's number one, just like they hated Carl's, Jr., out in California. Fast food place, big contributor, conservative causes. They hated Carl's, Jr., out there. When I first got to California in 1984 the guy driving me around pointed out a Carl's, Jr. "You gotta hate those people." He didn't know who I was. "They're a big contributor to right-wing causes." Wal-Mart is the same way. That's just part of it. Also, Wal-Mart has the rap that (sniveling liberal impression) "They're destroying mainstream America by coming in and putting up all these stores and mom and pops on mainstream are being shut down." The thing you have to look at here, Jill? It seems to me that the customers of Wal-Mart vote with their pocketbooks, their feet, and their automobiles. The parking lots are crowded. The sales are through the roof. Wal-Mart seems to be pleasing its customers pretty well. *What is the problem?* Who are their customers, the legislators of Maryland, US congressmen, city officials in Cleveland, or the people that go in the stores and actually buy things there?

CALLER: Exactly. Exactly.

RUSH: Most liberals arguing about Wal-Mart is like everything else haven't the slightest idea what they're talking about. They get talking points sent to them from websites and fax machines. Wal-Mart is evil because Wal-Mart is evil, that's all you need to know why, you don't need to know why, come up with some of these arguments. "Well, more than half their workforce is part time. They're trying to get away without paying health care benefits," blah, blah. Not only that, try this. Past couple years, three years, same bunch of people went after Wal-Mart because they're hiring too many illegals! The same people that don't want to do anything about illegal immigration, the same people ripping the minutemen for trying to call attention to illegal immigration problem, turn around, can bitch and moan at Wal-Mart because they're hiring too many illegals. If you ask me, this company is doing a whole lot of things right because all of liberalism is aligned against it. When liberalism is aligned against something, folks, you can be damn certain it is working. When liberalism shoots and aims its guns at everything, you can be damn certain it's good for America. When liberalism aims its *acid* at whatever institution in this country and tries to damage it or destroy it, you can be damn certain it is a good and great institution. Who's next on this program? Bob in Wenatchee, Washington. Welcome to the program.

CALLER: Hey, Rush.

RUSH: Yes.

CALLER: Uh, Rush, ummm...

RUSH: Come on! *Let's go. Let's go. Let's go. Let's go.* I'm on a roll here, let's go!

CALLER: Rush, the people pay for it. It doesn't matter if Wal-Mart pays for it or the government pays for it, the people are the only ones that ever pay for anything in this country. State governments don't have any money, federal government doesn't have any money. That's the way it is.

RUSH: It's even further than that. I know what (interruption). Mr. Snerdley is frowning at you, but I know what you're trying to say. They can take all this money from Wal-Mart all they want and give it to the people that run the state of Maryland to give to poor people, but where's that money going to come from? The price consumers pay when they go into Wal-Mart!

CALLER: Money only comes from one place, Rush.

RUSH: The people who earn it.

CALLER: The government doesn't have any money.

RUSH: Yes they do, after they take it from everybody else. They do have money, but it's never theirs. They don't generate it. They don't produce it. They print it and that's it.

CALLER: Well, that's it, so either Wal-Mart pays for it or we pay for it.

RUSH: Well, Wal-Mart doesn't pay for it. See what the total share of corporate taxes is. I mean corporations pay some, but I guarantee you, folks -- and this is not since the or anything else, it's economics. You go in and you want to buy something for \$9.95, I'll guarantee you in that \$9.95 is the corporate tax calculation that the business is going to have to pay on the income derived from the price you pay for the product. He's exactly right. We pay for everything. The people, the producers, the consumers, we are the economy. The economy is not Bill Clinton. The economy is not Alan Greenspan. The economy is not the US Congress. The economy is all of us engaging in commerce each and every day and pure and simple, and so if Wal-Mart is not paying health care benefits to enough of its employees and the state of Maryland says, "It's just not right..." By the way, who does this state of Maryland actually care about if they're going to take whatever Wal-Mart doesn't pay and give it to the poor... Is Wal-Mart paying health benefits to the poor anyway? Why should Wal-Mart pay? It's just a scam. It's just another scam designed by these legislators to get credit for increasing whatever payments they want to call them to the poor, when all they're doing is taking the money from you who live in Maryland who will pay it via higher prices at Wal-Mart. Pure and simple. But yet they target Wal-Mart as a big evil and when Wal-Mart raises prices to acknowledgement this legislation you of course are going to get mad at Wal-Mart, not the legislature in Maryland, which is part of their plan as well. The bottom line, look at this question we got from lady in Cleveland: That's scary. Doesn't Congress have a right to go in and take these funds?

END TRANSCRIPT