Comment Report

SF 167

A bill for an act relating to youth employment and making penalties applicable. (See SF 542.)

Subcommittee Members: Dickey-CH, Dotzler, Schultz

Date: 02/09/2023 Time: 11:00 AM Location: Room G15

Name: Ian Page-Echols

Comment: This is vile. Corporate profits are not worth our children going back to dieing in

mines or the meatpacking industry. Companies are making record profits, this is not needed or wanted in this country. Companies should always be liable for their employees of any age being injured on the job, not just for their health insurance but

all costs related to injuries on the job.

Name: Merissa Lewiston

Comment: In reference to SF 167As an Iowan, I would like to voice my concern over the

proposed changes and exemptions to our state's child labor law. While I realize that the state needs more qualified individuals in the workforce, I do not believe that those individuals are to be found among our minor population. I work with Iowa high school students in a volunteer position every summer, and their dedication &

potential is second to none. However, they are still children. From a scientific perspective, the brain of a teenager is not fully developed. Their actions are much more likely to be guided by the amygdalathe more emotional and reactive part of the

brain. These proposed exemptions would place our children in stressful and dangerous working conditions that they are not emotionally mature enough to navigate. Now I realize that these students would be "participating in workbased learning or a school or employeradministered, workrelated program.", "the activity will be performed under adequate supervision and training;" that "the training includes adequate safety precautions;" and that "the terms and conditions of the proposed employment will not interfere with the health, wellbeing, or schooling of

the minor enrolled in an approved program." This is vague, and allows room for schools and employers to pass the blame off to a child in the event of an accident or injury. I do not feel that the legal implications of placing minors in dangerous jobs have been fully explored. Combined with the liability exemption for businesses, this clearly places profit high above the welfare of our young people. In conclusion, I

respectfully recommend that our legislators work together to find a different solution

to the lack of qualified employees in our state. Merissa Lewiston

Name: Sarah Cho

Comment: Put child safety above corporate interests! This is disgusting and will set back

workers' rights by DECADES. The fact that it is even being considered is insane.

LEAVE CHILDREN ALONE.

Name: Kyle Cogley

Comment: This proposed bill is a horrendous set back for child labor laws and an

embarrassment to the state. There is no justified reason for permitting children to

work in these dangerous environments.

Name: Ellis Mertens

Comment: This is unfathomable. We shouldn't need to point out the slippery slope this would be

to Iowa lawmakers. This would set us back decades in terms of human rights and children's rights. We won't let children make decisions like drinking or smoking, but we trust them to make good choices in factories where they might lose limbs? Iowa can't be the state that sets of precedent of child sweatshops return to the United States. Anyone who would vote for this bill needs to be barred from public office. They're a menace, and they're trying to ruin our country for a buck.

Name: Cherie Miner

Comment: More profits over people. And policies like this continue Iowas brain drain in pursuit

of dollars for "conservative" political campaigns. It fits perfectly with the campaign to destroy public education. When will legislators support policies that invest in

Iowas people, in other words, our future?

Name: Sam Edmondson

Comment: It is vile that republicans want to roll back child labor laws for the sake of allowing

corporate donors to give them more money and keep them in power. You are going to attempt to allow children to be injured or worst for the sake of keeping corporate

interests? Pathetic.