

Talking About: *Unemployment Insurance*

Prepared by North Carolina State AFL-CIO
James Andrews, President

2013-14 Legislative Session
MaryBe McMillan, Secretary-Treasurer

Unemployment benefits help workers who lose jobs through no fault of their own and cannot find new employment; these benefits also help sustain the economy and are particularly important in economic times such as these.

How We Got Here

The Trust Fund, from which benefits are paid and which is supported by taxes on employers, is in severe deficit. A major reason is that in the 1990s, when both the economy and the Trust Fund were sound, taxes on employers were reduced. The lower tax rates were inadequate to support the Fund when the state suffered two successive economic downturns.

What's Wrong with This Proposal

- It would make up the deficit almost entirely on the backs of workers by drastically cutting unemployment benefits.
- This proposal would take our level of benefits which is currently in the middle of states to the bottom of the barrel.
- The proposed cuts would be the most draconian cuts made by the legislature of any state, including:
 - A cut in the maximum weekly benefit any worker can receive to \$350, a decrease of \$175/week;
 - A sliding scale reduction in the maximum duration of benefits from 26 to 20 weeks. If the economy improves even modestly, workers would receive even fewer weeks of benefits, in some cases as few as 12 weeks. Only one other state has such a sliding scale and only 7 have a maximum below 20;
 - A change in the formula used to determine benefit amounts that will result in lower checks for many workers, particularly those who have experienced a reduction in hours or wages;
 - A requirement that unemployed workers take any job that pays 120% of their benefit amount or become ineligible for benefits (the average worker who receives \$290/week in benefits would have to take any job offering \$8.70/hour);
 - An additional waiting week, which no other state has;
 - Elimination of provisions that allow benefits for workers who are unable to work at particular workplaces due to health conditions, are unable to accept shift changes because they must take care of minor children or disabled family members, or must leave their jobs because their spouses were transferred.
- By contrast, the proposal raises taxes on employers by only a small amount. The proposal

also relies on required federal tax surcharges on employers to reduce the deficit, **but these are only temporary. The cuts in benefits for unemployed workers are permanent.**

- Moreover, the proposal does nothing to put in place policies that support forward-financing to build a system that can weather economic downturns by ensuring adequate fund levels in the future.
- Rather, it continues the pay-as-you go model that puts the fund in crisis during future downturns and creates political pressure to cut benefits.

A Balanced Alternative

- Instead of dramatically cutting benefits, a more balanced approach should be taken that would expand the taxable wage base through better indexing, reforming the experience rating system, and the strengthening of re-employment services.
- For example, our taxable wage base is only indexed to 50% of the state's average annual wage. Increasing the taxable wage base to 60% would achieve solvency by 2016 alone and would increase contributions in the first year of implementation by about \$55 million and then incrementally increase in future years along with the growth in wages.

Protect Workers, Protect Our Economy

- **Unemployed workers depend on these benefits to pay bills, shop at local merchants, and keep their families going.** The proposed cuts would not only make their lives significantly more difficult but also would adversely affect our state's economy.
- A more balanced approach is plainly needed, **rather than one that depends almost entirely on severe sacrifices by those who cannot afford them and did nothing wrong.**

Tell Your Legislators

- Tell legislators that unemployed workers have a very difficult time getting by at current benefit levels and duration.
- Tell them it is **fundamentally unfair and bad economic policy** to solve the debt almost entirely by drastically cutting benefits for the many hard-working but vulnerable citizens who did nothing wrong, but cannot find other employment.

Also, make the conversation personal. If you have ever relied on unemployment insurance or if you know of co-workers or friends who have, tell these stories to legislators. They need to know what it is like to live and search for work on only partial wages. Legislators need to hear how unemployment insurance is a lifeline for working families and our economy.