COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

LABOR RELATIONS COMMITTEE

* * * * * * * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: House Bill 1155 and 1386

* * * * * * * * * *

BEFORE: Gene DiGirolamo, Chairman

Jarrett Gibbons, Gerald Metcalfe, Carl

Mantz, Tom Blackwell, Sean Ramaley

HEARING: Thursday, August 28, 2008

Commencing at 10:06 a.m.

LOCATION: Philadelphia Convention Center

Philadelphia, PA

WITNESSES: Debbie Plotnick, Samuel Denisco, Kevin

Shivers, Stephen Sweeney, Steffany Stern, Russell

Keating

Reporter: Daniel Urie

Any reproduction of this transcript is prohibited without authorization by the certifying agency.

												2
1			I	N .	D E	Х						
2												
3	OPENII	NG REMARKS										
4	Ву	Jarrett Gibbons							3	-	5	
5	TESTIMONY											
6	Ву	Debbie Plotnick							5	_	13	
7	Ву	Samuel Denisco							13	_	29	
8	Ву	Kevin Shivers							29	_	57	
9	Ву	Stephen Sweeney							57	_	81	
10	Ву	Steffany Stern							81	_	94	
11	Ву	Russell Keating							94	-	99	
12	CERTII	FICATE								1	0 0	
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												
21												
22												
23												
24												
25												

PROCEEDINGS

2 -----

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

I'd like to call this meeting of Labor
Relations Committee to order. Today we're going to be
discussing House Bill 1386, this is a --- the Family
Temporary Care Act. We'll start with introductions of
the panel, starting, I guess, with my left here with
Jamie Geronimo.

MR. GERONIMO:

1

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

Jamie Geronimo from Bucks County.

MR. METCALFE:

Good morning, State Representative Gerald Metcalfe from Butler County.

MR. MANTZ:

Good morning, Carl Mantz Representing the 187th Legislative District straddling Burks and Lehigh Counties.

MR.BLACKWELL:

Good morning, Tom Blackwell from the Pennsylvania District of Philadelphia County.

MR. RAMALEY:

Good morning, Sean Ramaley from the 16th District, Beaver and Allegheny County.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

All right. Thank you and I am 1 Representative Jarrett Gibbons from the 10th District 3 Beaver, Lawrence and Butler Counties and the proud sponsor of House Bill 1386. I just want to make some brief introductory comments describing the bill. Wе did hear a little bit about this in our hearing 6 yesterday in conjunction with House Bill 1155 unpaid sick leave. Basically, the premise of this bill is to provide paid sick leave --- paid leave for Family Temporary Care. This would, basically, be a wage 10 11 replacement under --- for people that are taking leave 12 under the FMLA, Family Medical Leave Act. This would provide up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for anyone who 13 14 is --- up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for anyone who 15 is taking time off to care for sick family members, it is limited in scope to either a spouse, parent or 16 17 child, so it is fairly limited.

There is a one-week waiting period

before it takes effect and there is a requirement that

no other family member be able to provide the care so

it is limited in a sense. They all --- the person

must also not be eligible for unemployment

compensation and it must be taken concurrently with

FMLA leave, if the person is eligible. However, it

does extend beyond persons who are eligible for FMLA

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

so that even outside of people who are FMLA eligible, which would be employers with --- employees of employers with more than 50 employees and other requirements. This would take employees who also may not be part of the FMLA.

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And as explained this would provide a wage replacement because, you know, considering the fact that someone who has to take leave, say first of having a child, oftentimes they cannot take the leave they want because they need the money, especially, our low wage workers who are out there and need those wages, can't take two, three, four, up to 12 weeks off to care for a child and give up those paychecks. this is a way for those people to take the time they need to go and to be with their children, to be with their loved ones in their times of need and still continue to meet their needs and pay their bills. With that said, I'm sure we'll have a lot more comments throughout this period. I want to get started with our speakers and call up our first speaker Debbie Plotnick and Corey Rogers, they're with the Mental Health Association of Southeastern Pennsylvania.

MS. PLOTNICK:

Good morning, good morning members of

the panel. Thank you very much for inviting me. Unfortunately, I have to say that my colleague Corey Rogers took ill yesterday afternoon, so he will not be joining us today, but I will also speak to Corey's remarks, which can be in the record.

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'm the Director of Advocacy at the Mental Health Association of Southeastern Pennsylvania and in my professional rule I'm often called upon to speak about the needs of people who have mental illnesses and about those experiences of families of folks affected by metal illness.

And I'm very happy to be here, I thank you for inviting me today. I'm going to separate my remarks into two sections regarding the two pieces of proposed legislation. I'm first going to speak about House Bill 1155, the Healthy Families, Healthy Workplace Bill and I really would like to commend the authors of this legislation. I think that it is amazingly inclusive and it represents many types of familial relationships, it is greatly sensitive to issues that are not ordinarily spoken about, such as mental health issues and domestic violence when we talk about benefits for employees and I'm sure, as you heard in yesterday's testimony, everybody relates to 25 having the need for sick days when you have the flu or

1 if one of the kids is home sick. But, many, many
2 Pennsylvanians need to take the day off to attend to
3 their own metal health needs or to the mental health
4 needs of their family members, of their spouses, of
5 their children.

The National Institute of Mental Health estimates that in a given year, one in four adults suffers from a diagnosable mental illness and I know from my training and years of working in the mental health field, that the vast majority of people with mental health disorders want to work and many, many people do work and they work successfully. In fact, employment is a major component of recovery from mental health issues.

And even if we're not aware of it, many of us have colleagues who periodically need to take a day and go see their psychiatrist and have their medications adjusted or to take a day or two to deal with an --- what could turn into an impending mental health crisis, but with the proper care, that can be avoided. That's especially important for folks who have mental health conditions and most of them can successfully control these illnesses, which are episodic and often chronic but, generally, can be controlled with the proper medication and work, as I

said, a very important part of recovery.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 I also know from personal experience, 3 how vital the role parents play in the mental health of their children and getting children who have a mental illness as well. My now grown daughter, 5 Ashley, is an amazing and resilient 26-year-old woman, 6 she's a registered nurse, she has a college degree, she also happens to have a major mental health illness, she has bipolar disorder and for four harrowing years from when she was 14 until she was 18, 10 11 more times than I care to remember, my daughter came 12 close to dying and it took a lot of time and a lot of attention and a lot of support to help her get her 13 illness under control. 14

And every day my professional life is informed by the knowledge of how lucky I was and my husband, we were fortunate, we had health insurance. Although it didn't pay for all the mental health issues, it paid for all the related medical issues. We had good enough credit to pay for the rest of the mental health costs that weren't covered. But what we were really lucky for that a lot of parents don't have, and speaks directly to this, is the flexibility in our work schedules to be able to take the time to attend to our daughter, to go when it was necessary to

visit her in the hospital, to get her to appointments, unfortunately, occasionally, that --- take that time off for an emergency room visit.

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Sometimes hospitals and psychiatric hospitals, in particular for kids, only have visiting 6 hours during the day, it's very, very important for parents to be part of the process of getting their kids well. Parents also have to attend to discharge planning. Kids don't exist in isolation, they're part of a family unit. For families struggling with mental health issues it's imperative that the parents be available and these kinds of things don't happen around working hours.

We also know in Philadelphia where there's a shortage of mental health practitioners, and there is one, it is less severe than other parts of the state. But still the average wait, even if there's a crisis, for getting an outpatient appointment for a youngster is about three weeks and parents can't afford to say, I can't go because it's the middle of my workday. They have to be there and they're torn between their jobs and most of them choose their kids, but if that risks losing their job, that's not helping their kids either. And this legislation would really go a long way to protect

families, to protect kids, to help them raise their kids, to help folks who have mental health issues, be successful in their recovery and I really urge its adoption and I thank you for allowing me to speak on it.

I'd also like to, if I may, since I --my colleague, Corey Rogers, who is my program manager,
he's my director of Adult Advocacy at the Mental
Health Association and he couldn't be here today, but
he wanted to speak to House Bill 1386, the Family
Temporary Care Act. And I'm going to let Corey's
remarks go into the record and I'll just speak about
--- because I can't speak for Cory, but I'll speak
about what this would have meant for my family had it
been in place and FMLA, which also wasn't in place at
the time that my family was dealing with this issue,
but I will tell you that I deal with folks all the
time and I can tell a little bit about Corey's story.

We know from dealing with folks and helping them in their advocacy issues and Corey gets calls all the time from families that are struggling to help their spouses, to help themselves, to help their kids who are having serious mental health issues. And very often what happens is extended time has to be taken from work to care for yourself or for

a family member, and that is often necessary for mental health issues, and I know you've heard about many other types of issues from the other folks who have been testifying.

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But what happens in these situations is that if there's a mental health crisis and, for example, if it's a spouse and both members have to be out of work, people lose their homes, they lose their apartments or can't make their mortgage payments and we see a cycle all the time of people losing all the gains they made in their recovery if they can't take the time that they need to be at home to get things under control to get their acute illness back into a managed phase. And that's the kind of pressure that really is not only felt by the families, but also by the Commonwealth in areas such as families needing to go onto medical assistance if the jobs are lost, folks needing to go into public housing if the housing is lost. It puts a greater burden on taxpayers and on individuals and on families than the small costs of paying into an insurance system or paid for by employers to keep folks well, to keep them in their homes, to keep them having health insurance.

It makes a huge difference. These are both very important pieces of legislation. Again, we

12 very much support them and thank you for the opportunity to speak about them today, thank you. 2 3 REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS: 4 Thank you, Debbie. 5 MS. PLOTNICK: You're welcome. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS: Any questions? All right. Well, thank 8 You, Debbie, for coming to this ---. PANEL MEMBER: 10 11 Just a comment, Debbie, and, you know, 12 thank you for being here today and I went through a 13 similar situation with one of my children also so I 14 know what you're talking about and went through it for 15 a number of years and I really appreciate you being 16 here sharing your story of your daughter, Ashley, with 17 us today. It takes courage, it really does, so ---18 MS. PLOTNICK: 19 Well, thank you. 20 PANEL MEMBER: 21 --- thank you for the good work that 22 you do ---23 MS. PLOTNICK: 24 Thank you. 25 PANEL MEMBER:

--- and thank you for being here today and sharing that story with us.

MS. PLOTNICK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Thank you. It's my pleasure and I can't stress enough that stories where there's support really can turn out very, very well. We're very proud of our daughter, she leads a very successful life and I appreciate you saying so. Thank you so much, thank you all.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Thank you, Debbie.

MS. PLOTNICK:

You're welcome.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Next I'd like to call Samuel Denisco, director, Government Affairs for the Pennsylvania Chamber of Business Industry.

MR. DENSICO:

Good morning, Chairman DiGirolamo, Representative Gibbons, members of the committee, thank you for having me here today. My name is Sam Denisco. I am director of Government Affairs for the Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry. 24 Pennsylvania Chamber is the largest broad-based 25 business advocacy association in the Commonwealth,

serving 24,000 members and customers. The

Pennsylvania Chamber membership comprises nearly 50

percent of the private workforce and our membership

ranges from Fortune 100 companies to sole proprietors

and crosses all industries sectors.

6 Thank you for giving the Chamber the 7 opportunity to testify today on House Bills 1155 and House Bill 1155 would require employers to provide employees with paid sick leave to be used to 10 cover their employees on illness or the illness of a 11 family member. House Bill 1386 would require 12 employees, employers and employees to pay in a fund in 13 order for employees to receive wage replacement benefits so they can care for a spouse, child or a 14 parent with a serious health condition or to bond with 15 16 a newborn or adopted child. While both those are well 17 intended they are very problematic for employers and 18 employees alike. First and foremost, these bills 19 restrict employer flexibility in meeting the needs of 20 the respective workforces. Most businesses have structured their workforces in a fashion that 21 22 adequately meets the needs of its employees while not 23 compromising the work product of the employer. 24 employer has to provide paid sick leave for the reason set forth on House Bill 1155, they may not be able to 25

do so for other valid reasons such as military leave,

bereavement leave and personal days for religious

observations. Additionally, if an employer has to

fund family leave pursuant the House Bill 1386, the

employer may do so by cutting back on other employee

benefit programs, such as short-term and long-term

disability policies in order to fund the family leave.

In the end many employers may look for relief in their

wage structure, their 401(k) contributions, their

health insurance contributions or other employee

benefits.

The business community favors legislation that strikes a balance between the needs of employers and those they employ. This balance is key in our economically competitive market. Legislation that tips the scale one way could result in the loss of a business or limited growth for the state, both of which would hurt employers and employees equally. Paid leave is an example of legislation that tips the scales in the wrong direction. The business community believes that government should avoid stepping in between the employer and the employee from a benefit perspective. Some employees want a greater 401(k) contribution, others might want to work a full week in just four days and still others may seek flex time.

These options are accomplished when employers and employees work together and not when government steps in and mandates a one-size-fits-all benefit package.

Paid sick leave mandates reduce employers' flexibility to tailor benefit packages to the workforce's particular needs. For instance, young single workers may have little interest in paid sick leave and would prefer higher wages and larger 401(k) contributions. Similarly, workers in families --- workers with families may prefer better health insurance benefits with smaller co-pays and deductibles.

This legislation is especially
burdensome and disruptive for small businesses that
require skilled employees. For instance, if a
business employs five people and one goes out for 12
weeks there's no way to easily replace that person.
The other four team members will have to pick up the
extra work forcing them to work longer hours. This
will not enhance the work environment and certainly
does not do anything to lay a foundation for
supporting healthy families in the workforce. In
fact, those left to maintain productivity will
experience additional stress on themselves and their
families working longer hours to maintain

profitability.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 Currently, there are a number of industries where it's difficult to find full time 3 employees. The challenge will be made all the more difficult if House Bill 1386 is enacted. For instance, if the job is offered for only 12 weeks in 6 duration, this will effectively allow the temporary employee, if eligible, to opt for a fully paid 12 week leave immediately upon arrival at his or her new In addition, a number of industries 10 employment. 11 require a license for unemployment. It would be very 12 difficult to find another licensed professional to work for 12 weeks so the employer would be either 13 forced to ignore the customer or to add to the 14 15 workload of the employees who didn't go out on leave. Either way someone loses in this scenario. 16

Additionally, there are other issues in the bill that are unclear which may lead to an unintended litigious environment. For instance, House Bill 1155 defines family member to include spouse, child, parent, grandparent, extended family member or any other individual related by blood or affinity whose relationship with the employee is equivalent to a family relationship. Based on this definition, it would be nearly impossible to draw a fine line as to

who is covered under this definition. Arguable, it can be anyone. This broad definition will inevitably invite abuses of this policy and fraudulent leave claims. In the end, employers who draw lines as to who is family may have to defend themselves in court.

Finally, these represent a costly
mandate on employers. The bills, if enacted, will
increase costs for employers at a time when many
employers are laying off employees for economic
reasons. Mandatory paid benefits that increase small
business costs would have to be recouped elsewhere,
perhaps through reduced wages or fewer benefits paid
in other areas. In cases where employees take leave
with little or no notice, employers may even face
double payments, pay for both the person taking sick
leave and for the person called in to cover the shift.

In conclusion, addressing the needs of employers and employees is paramount to a successful workforce. By allowing businesses to meet the diverse needs of its workforce without government mandates, employers will be able to effectively operate in competitive markets and maintain the flexibility to support healthy families and a healthy workforce. This concludes my testimony, again, thank you Chairman DiGirolamo, Representative Gibbons, members of the

committee for allowing me to appear before you today and I will be happy to answer any question that you may have.

REPRESENTATIVE METCALF:

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Thank you, Sam for your testimony today, we appreciate it. I think when we've heard testimony yesterday and I believe, you heard most of my testimony yesterday also and testimony again this morning and there's a lot of heartfelt testimony about a lot of tragic situations and dire situations people find themselves in. Unfortunately, I think when we see some of this legislation drafted, some of my colleagues draft this as if they're living in a vacuum and it's not going to impact anybody with any negative consequences and I think they think they're drafting it if they're on Treasure Island and they found some chest of gold that is going to be able to pay for all of this. Whereas, I appreciate the points that you made in your testimony because if we advance policies that the government interjects themselves in between employees and employers in this fashion, ultimately, we're going to see some employers not be employers anymore. They'll be employees themselves looking for jobs elsewhere because they won't be able to maintain a business or create the jobs that we need to sustain

our families here in Pennsylvania. So I appreciate
the points that you've made, there's a lot of coined
arguments that are made of why an employer should
provide this type of leave and I think that employers
that are able to, try to do so because they know that
it helps them to bring in better employees and keep
the employees.

I think the many options that you mentioned was a great plan with the flextime and all the many variables that somebody can eject into their benefit system as an employer and they're going to pay the cost somewhere else if we start having government mandate, a one-size-fits-all policy, so, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Representative Blackwell.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACKWELL:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Well, I appreciate your testimony. I'm a follow a ring leader who's negotiating contracts with many employers who are good, many who are fair and many who just didn't care as long as they get a profit. I believe that the need for this legislation arises out of complaints that some employees had along with some employers because the uncompetitivness with other employers who do offer benefits such as these.

I might also add that there was testimony that how unproductive a worker can be when their mind is not on their work. And in spite of that, we continue to employ people which can in turn cause them to get sick. So that adds to the cost of also replacing that employee because through no fault of the employer and no fault of the employee, circumstances happen. These are human events of human nature that occur.

1

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

So while I do agree that you do have some employers that are responsible and try to operate in a responsible manner and do care about their employees, I won't go as far as saying that the employers don't care. I would say that some employers just don't understand the importance of having a happy worker, which in turn makes a productive worker. while we don't want to actually intrude on businesses and business policy, sometimes the government has to look at what's fair because it all in turn, affects the economy. We try to understand. Not only am I a former labor leader but I also happened to have grandparents who owned a store in a community for over So I understand the bottom line. understand the cost value. But meanwhile we have to do something to help employers to understand that

sometimes, you know, we need a little motivation to help the employer to understand that there are human needs and trying to help him to better his business we're also looking at a human element.

Sometimes, when you look at sometimes too much at your profit margin, you forget the human, some employers do and I know that through experience.

I've seen employers make record profits, record profits, while they're steadily laying off people when they don't have to. I've seen it happen, I've seen employers have flexible hours when they did not have to have flexible hours. We do have some responsible employers who won't, but like I said, sometimes you do have to look at what can be done and offer also --- sometimes it takes incentives to business to offer these types of programs, so I'm not --- my mind is not closed to that.

But we have to look at a fair way of doing business, because it's not fair just to say --- you know, I once heard --- I won't mention the name of the colleague that said it, he told his employees, you know, we're going to cut 20 percent and tell him you can't, you get fire. Well, the incentive is I'm going to do it because if I don't do it I'm going to get fired. Well, guess what, when you run your own

business sometimes you have these opportunities to do that, being fair or not, but meanwhile that's why I 3 got elected, to help people who do not have a voice, you know, Charles said, you know, maybe it could be part of a collective bargaining. Well, some people don't have that privilege because they're not part of a collective bargaining union. Well, meanwhile for those people that don't have that that's, I believe, what we're for. I believe electing officials that are there to help improve the quality of life for people 10 11 that includes people with mental disorders, that 12 includes people who have problems, because I also happen to have the experience with mental people who 13 have mental disabilities, adults with mental 14 15 disabilities.

I used to work for a beautiful, wonderful place called Community Interactions of Delaware County who happen to care about their people, you know, but, meanwhile, they needed help too in a financial way because of the high turn-over rate of employees because they weren't allowed --- they weren't able to offer a higher wage, so, guess what?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Either the person got --- the employee got an opportunity to go to a place with a higher wage, they left, now you know what, that employer has

to now spend money training the new employee before he can get the employee into the regular line of work, line of time --- also while he's doing that, you have people working overtime another cost to the employer. So what we're trying to do is not have that situation occur. So it's going to take the management and the employee, employer and employee working together to try to come up with a solution. Do I like mandates?

9 Of course not, but sometimes in this business you'll find that they are needed. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

11

12 All right. I'd just like to ask a couple of things and point out a couple concepts. 13 14 Number one, just as it relates to the paid sick leave, 15 you point out about young workers having little interest in paid sick leave, but, I guess, the fact I 16 17 look at with young workers who --- you're like, you're 18 right are less likely to maybe get illnesses 19 depending, but if they're not taking the sick leave then it's not costing the employer anything to offer 20 And so, realistically, if these people aren't 21 22 taking it, there's no cost to it. Now that the cost 23 is only if you take it and if they're taking it ---24 while we had some comments yesterday, questions as to, you know, abuse and questions of that nature, if they

are sick we did hear some things about productivity and how it increased productivity to have these people take off when they need to.

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I also want to point out you mentioned about a person taking 12 --- you know, and this in relation of House Bill 1386 on the Temporary Care Insurance. Person who is offered a job for 12 weeks coming in, taking leave immediately, but my understanding, and I'm not an expert on FMLA, but you have to be an employee with the company for one year prior to being eligible for FMLA. This is a wage replacement for people who are taking FMLA leave. unless you're with the company that employs more than 50 people or --- now, that's not to say that people who are employees of companies with less than 50 people would not be eligible, but their jobs would not be protected under FMLA. Now, again, it is my understanding, but, you know, --- my understanding in my background with FMLA is that you have to be there at least one year prior. So the circumstance that you're pointing would be impossible. If they came in they might be able to seek wage replacement, but you wouldn't have to protect their job because they wouldn't be FMLA eligible and this --- my understanding of House Bill 1386 as I drafted it,

isn't providing additional protection for the job,

it's providing wage replacement for people taking FMLA

leave. So, I mean, I don't know if you have a comment

on that, but, at least, my understanding is that

situation that you point out wouldn't be created under

this bill.

MR. DENISCO:

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Representative Gibbons, very good question. My read of the bill is, there is no eligibility requirements for this wage replacement, it doesn't say that an individual must work X amount of hours nor is it contingent on meeting eligibility requirements of the federal law. So, for instance, if a individual was offered a job that was going to start in two months and the individual shows up at the workplace and within a week they have an unexpected family emergency or an emergency for an individual that they have a quote unquote affinity with, they would essentially be eligible to opt for the wage replacements aside from federal law. So to tighten it up a little maybe draw a fine line as to the 1,250 hours work --- work in first, much like the sick leave bill too if it hit the 90 days out.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Well, for one, they had --- I think we

do have to differentiate between the two bills and their definitions of family. The affinity think is not in this bill, this bill is very strictly limited as to either the birth of a child or a spouse or parent. So this isn't defined as broadly as the sick leave bill where, as you pointed out, it is much more extensive as to reasons you can take sick leave.

But, again, as I said, perhaps we do have to look at the clarities, but, as I read the bill, it does not create a job protection. FMLA created a job protection so that a person wanting to take leave, their job would be protected when they return from that leave.

This bill creates no protection for that job. So you're right in that sense, someone could come in a week later, apply for this, because you're right, there is no time restriction and I agree with you that maybe there's something we should look into, making sure that they are, you know, maybe putting some of those requirements in. But even as drafted now, that job would not be protected under FMLA. So they would --- it would be the possibility that job, you know, could be replaced during that period of time, not that I'm advocating that, that should happen, but, that is a --- that does seem to me to be

a possibility under this.

2

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, I mean, we have to look at what we're providing here, it's not --- the job protection is provided under the FMLA, under the federal law, which FMLA must be --- as the bill's written, must be taken concurrently with this, if you're eligible. So, you know, we are not looking to protect the job in this bill, that's been done under the FMLA and its rules.

This is specifically just replacing the lost wages that a person was eligible for FMLA would be taking or as I said, if they weren't eligible they could receive the benefit. But then it would be up to the employer whether or not they would be decided to hold the job for them. So I think that that situation just does not seem to be to me --- again like I said, maybe there is some clarity, but, does not seem to me to be covered as creating a problem under this. kind of the same, you know, I quess I'd make this other comment about the small team. The fact is if its factor isn't workforce, again, not FMLA eligible, not more than 50 people. So again, I think, you know, really this bill has to be looked at in conjunction with the FMLA because that is the primary source of what we're trying to do is replace those people who

were out for those reasons. So any other questions? All right. Well, thank you very much.

MR. DENISCO:

Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Next I'd like to call up Kevin Shivers from the National Federation of Independent Businesses.

MR. SHIVERS:

Good morning. On behalf of the small business members of the National Federation of Independent Business, I'd like to tell you how much I appreciate you inviting me before the committee today.

Just to give you a little explanation of who small business is, the members that we represent. NFIB represents the mom and pop businesses that are on Main Street in every township, borough and city everywhere in Pennsylvania. Our typical member employs five or fewer workers. Our members generate gross sales of about \$400,000 to \$500,000 a year and their take home pay for those business owners are about \$50,000 a year. So, you know, contrary to the consensus, you know, our members are not rich, they're rich in pride, they're rich in love for their country, they're rich in love for the business owners or the

employees and their families that they're supporting, but, they're not doing this by in large, to get rich quick, they're working hard at what they do.

And the small business members of NFIB urge you to oppose the paid leave mandates that are proposed in House Bill 1155 and 1386. These mandates would force small business owners to implement policies that may not be in the best interest of their workers and bury them under an avalanche of new paperwork, red tape and headaches.

NFIB believes small business owners should be free to do what is best for their workers and their companies. One-size-fits-all employment policies like those proposed in House Bill 1155 and House Bill 1386 do not work well for small businesses that need flexible workplace rules and policies to juggle the needs of their workers and run their business.

What may work for Wal-Mart always
doesn't work for Main Street. I think that's a
critical point. You know, often times when we come
before the committee, when you're talking about
employer mandates, you know, I'm regularly, you know,
hit with questions from panelists and even my
colleagues at the AFL-CIO, they'll be signing the big

1 box stores that are also signing some kind of an egregious action in the big corporation, well, 3 remember they operate very differently than small employers do. You know, my members will tell you, you know, nine times out of ten, they're the ones that are doing the hiring and the firing, they're the ones that are taking out the trash, they're the ones that are filling in when their employees aren't there in the job place. An interesting point is dealing with the FMLA bill, if you think about it, I mean, it's 10 11 creating two classes of individuals here because an 12 employee is entitled to FMLA under this, but, you know, small business owners they adopt kids too, their 13 family members get sick, they need to take time off 14 and they're not recognized under this legislation, 15 something to think about. 16

Employer mandates like those proposed in House Bill 1155 and House Bill 1386 hurt the very workers they're intended to help and take away small employers' and workers' freedoms to negotiate benefit packages that meet the needs of their workers and the business. In addition, they invite excessive and unnecessary litigation, as well as impose significant legal and administrative costs on the small business.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A similar leave mandate proposal was

defeated earlier this month in California. A study released in June by the NFIB Research Foundation showed the loss of approximately 370,000 jobs within five years in California had AB 2716 become law.

In addition to the significant job losses, the bill would have imposed a direct cost, just like a tax, of \$4.6 billion on California employers that would've disproportionately affected the small business community.

The NFIB Research Foundation also examined a paid sick leave proposal in Ohio. Even with an exemption for employers with fewer than 25 workers, the Ohio paid leave mandate is expected to cost business almost \$1.2 billion annually and result in about 75,000 lost jobs over five years, 41 percent of those losses would come from small businesses.

Now again, I think it's important to point out, we're not necessarily talking about people that are going to be fired; we're talking about jobs that are not going to be created. That small employer with five employees or in this case, in Ohio, that small employer with 24 employees, what we've heard anecdotally is, they just won't hire that 25th one or that 26th employee because they know that if they do they'd be subject then to this mandate, so again, it's

going to stimey job growth, it's going to stimey economic development.

Small business owners also value their 3 employees and understand that everyone can be subject to illness, emergency or family obligations. 5 You know, our members treat their employees like family 6 and in a small business you need flexibility. the thing that keeps the company coming together unlike in a large company, where you may just be a number, you know, in small businesses they treat each 10 11 other very differently. Most small business owners, 12 in fact, provide flexible leave for illness and family situations and do so in a way that meets the needs of 13 both their workers and the business. Recent NFIB 14 15 small business polls report, 96 percent of small business owners offer flexible work hours when 16 17 personal situations arise. About 75 percent of small 18 business owners already provide their workers with 19 some type of paid sick leave and over 2/3 recently 20 granted family leave as a paid leave.

Small business workers and employers know the best way to shape a benefit package that meets the needs of a particular workplace. If these new mandates are enacted, employers tell us, that they likely would be forced to eliminate personal time,

21

22

23

24

vacation pay or limit future pay increases.

In fact, we've been told that some employers, who may offer more than the required, the mandated amount of leave, might actually scale those back because they know that all of their competitors are only going to offer the same amount as well. In a small business, co-workers also are often forced to be the ones to pick up the slack for the absent workers.

Small businesses have a particularly difficult time in filling the gabs when employees can not work. A small business owner with five employees loses 20 percent of his work force, if his workforce with just one employee who doesn't report for work.

More than 90 percent of businesses cope with employee absences by reassigning work to other employees. According to a National Small Business poll the most frequent ways to compensate for an employees absence are assigning other workers to cover, 71 percent report they do that, the owner or the owners family cover, 63 percent know that and I've had a situation where I've had some work done on my house, fortunately, the business owner actually came out to do the work and postponing the employees work, you know, eliminating that particular type of assignment, 21 percent.

Many small employers simply can't afford to absorb the cost of paying and training replacement workers for an employee on leave or to pay co-workers overtime to share the expanded work, again, we make due with what we have and this is all we can afford.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NFIB members certainly did not advocate employees coming to work if they're sick or otherwise, unable to work, however, a mandate to require paid leave assumes small business owners don't currently offer flexible leave policies and this simply isn't Additionally, employment market pressures assure that leave will continue to be commonly given regardless of legislative action and should act in offering flexible benefit packages, I mean, we've come before this committee before and one of things we've talked about is many times our members are losing the competition for good quality workers because they can't offer high quality health benefit packages like their big business colleagues can, with bigger benefits and bigger health insurance products or better health insurance products.

One of the ways that they're able to fill the gap and meet those needs is by offering flexible work schedules and other types of flexibility, you know, to encourage those employees to

come to those businesses.

2 Given Pennsylvania's current economic 3 challenges, a looming budget deficit, rising unemployment, soaring energy prices and sky high health insurance premiums, Pennsylvania's small business owners can ill afford another costly new mandate or in this instance two mandates and I should point out that we, you know, one of the things that we sometimes fail to remember --- remind ourselves is that, you know, in state government it's an 10 11 accumulative process, you know, this committee already 12 has before it bills to mandate paid coffee breaks, to mandate lunch periods, now we're talking about 13 providing mandated paid sick leave, we're talking 14 15 about mandated, you know, FMLA and then a couple of years ago we mandated an increase in the minimum wage. 16 17 When small employers are spending monthly mortgage 18 payments to pay for their employees' health care and 19 now the legislature is looking at imposing new mandates on them, what are they to do? 20 21 I mean, the legislature is basically, 22 telling these small employers that paid sick leave is 23 more important than health care. So what is an employer going to do, are they going to continue to 24

provide those health benefits or are they going to

continue to provide paid coffee breaks, paid sick
leave time or other types of mandated costs of doing
business. So with that we stand ready work with the
general assemble to insure that additional economic
burdens are not placed on small business and we urge
the members of the committee to oppose these two
legislative proposals and with that, I would be happy
to answer any questions.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Representative Gergely.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

Good morning, Kevin.

MR. SHIVERS:

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Good morning, Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

How are you doing today?

MR. SHIVERS:

Good, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

All right. With the small businesses, if you look at 1155, please. You do realize that it would only have asked ten or under to only have three paid sick days and then I looked at page one last paragraph. Small business owners with five employees lose 20 percent of his workforce if one employee does

not report for work. I would assume there has to be some flexibility with this owner. Are they not paying these employees when they don't come to work now when they're sick?

MR. SHIVERS:

2.4

Well, I mean, according to my testimony, I mean, virtually all employers are offering some type of a flexible leave package and 75 percent of them are providing some type of a paid leave component for their employees. In the instance where you have that one person who leaves chances are who's going to fill the time, it's going to be the owner.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

I think what all of the committee's struggling with is testimony like yourself --- like yourself and others and testimony from the other side, to find the middle on this, it's so far apart and, you know, of course this committee has to find a middle where these numbers mesh together and you could present your information and I could present ACORN's information and yet these are miles apart from each other. So that's troubling to me that the information --- sometimes with issues information presented is much --- there's much more clarity than on this and we say that many will say that offering paid sick leave,

especially like for domestic violence is health --- is a healthy family's act related issue and you know, can't figure out if that's the commitment too because if five or six percent of your small businesses don't do that you are going to be --- we heard a number of testimonies yesterday, I know you weren't here, about --- they were bringing it up, that at some point the Foundation was probably were opposing child labor laws saying small businesses need child labor.

We wonder, you know, where's the necessity stop, that's all and I just wanted to assure you that if you had any more information about the loss of the cost, et cetera, please share it with us.

MR. SHIVERS:

Absolutely, I mean, once I got --actually, groups like ACORN who come here to advocate
on these mandates are also advocating that they be
exempted from them.

There was a fascinating court case in California, for example, with the minimum wage mandate where they actually sought to be relieved from the minimum wage mandate because they felt that it was going to be an undo financial burden on them.

So, you know, I kind of take --- sometimes I take their comments with a grain of salt, but, you

know, you're absolutely right, I mean, you know, there really is a question of how do we meet the needs and 3 what are those needs of employees and you know, your --- I certainly can't criticize you for entertaining these issues, the question is where are those 5 priorities? Because in another committee in another side of the building we're talking about mandating health care, you know. And now, you know, in this committee you have three or four different mandates that we're dealing with, mandated paid coffee breaks. 10 11 So the question is, what do you --- where do you ---12 you know, these employers, small employers I'm speaking of now, they value their employees and you're 13 right, you know, there may be a few that don't treat 14 15 their employees the way they should and quite frankly, you know, they're probably going to be out of business 16 17 because most workers I know they'll hit the streets after they've been treated roughly a few times. 18 19

Of course, there's a few people that they need the job. Well, those are hard workers and certainly, those types of people, I think, are going to survive in the workplace, they're going to be attracted to employers or employers that do care are going to find those people.

20

21

22

23

24

25

There needs to be a happy medium. I

mean, I absolutely think we need to figure out what that middle ground is. My job today is just to remind you that a one-size-fits-all mandate doesn't particularly work within the business community.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Representative Metcalfe.

REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

Thank you. And thank you, Kevin, for your testimony today and the point that you made about the average salary that many of your members are pulling down is, I think you said, around \$50,000.

I was out talking with a small business owner the other day in the district and he was telling me how the effect of the high fuel prices is really impacting his business and he has several truck drivers that work for him and he said him and his wife who, you know, are owners of the business, that they were actually looking at laying off many of their truck drivers because it was going to be cheaper to let the trucks sit idle and make the payments on them rather than run them, paying the salaries and the high fuel costs and as much as, the fuel had impacted their business. So that very small profit margin there on that part of their small business that was potentially leading to some lay offs. I think they tried to ride

the wave out, fuel prices have dipped a little bit.

So I they're still able to keep those folks employed.

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But, I think the greater point that you have made in your testimony with Representative Gergely is a question about, you know, if you have some six or seven percent, five percent of businesses that aren't providing these types of benefits and they're hurting people. I would say it was going to hurt people more if those employers aren't able to provide jobs because of the accumulative effect of all of the regulations, burden, mandates that the legislature is looking to put on businesses whether it's payment of health care or it's payment for coffee breaks or it's payment for lunch breaks or it's payment for sick days, they're not being really paid or a payment for some leave time that might take a five person shop down to four people and reduce productivity by 20 percent that the owner has to try to make up in some way for several up to months.

MR. SHIVERS:

Yeah, Representative, I couldn't agree with you more and I think a critical point you just made is you're absolutely right about the economy and I failed to mention that in my testimony. You know I've been in the workforce now for a little under 20

years and, you know, we --- NFIB has been doing a small business optimism index where we measure what small employer's attitudes nationally are about the economy, prospectively. And apparently, you know, according to the folks that have been tracking this since 1974, I mean, this is probably one of the most pessimistic times in our period --- our recent memory, I mean, beyond since I've been in the workplace and certainly, since you know, some of the major recessions in the 1980s.

And right now employers are doing their level best just to be able to keep work going for these people because they recognize, I mean, in a small business, you know, the people that work for you. I mean, they're extended family, you know, you're talking about that employee and their family, you know, and they feel a real obligation to them and to making sure that they still have available hours so that they can put food on the table. And you know, now is probably the worst time to be talking about imposing new administrative costs and new burdens on these people because they are doing their level best with gas prices the way they are, with the price of food, with the price of health care, other, you know, costs of doing business, they are doing their level

best to keep these people on.

I think that should be our goal for this committee, if I can offer a recommendation, what can we do to encourage full employment, you know, those are the kinds of things that this committee could be very helpful in working with small job creators is what can we do to make sure that small business people can hire as many people as they possible can.

REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

I would like to thank you for putting a face on the individuals that are being talked about, as far as, the individuals who are going to have to foot the bill for what's being proposed here.

I think the way to get a theory, if you're talking about unlimited resources we all would like to make sure that everybody has, you know, unlimited health care options, unlimited days off for when there are bereavement situations or tragic situations in their family's lives or an illness.

But, at the end of the day somebody has to pay for it and many times those in government continue to lift burdens upon the back of those individuals who are job creators thinking that we'll just put one more burden on their back here, they'll take care of it.

And when government needs to have some

additional resources then they just go back to the same individuals they've lifted that burden on the back and say we'll we got another burden for you because we need more from you also, which, I think is a crying shame and it's going to ultimately kill our economy if we don't understand what's really made America great and let government do what it's supposed to do, which is very limited and let the market place do the rest, so, thank you.

MR. SHIVERS:

Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Representative Blackwell.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACKWELL.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This particular testimony, I appreciate --- what you said. I'm reminded of the \$1,300 a month electricity bill my uncle used to have to pay just to run his refrigeration end of the business. This is a cost he cannot recoup. So while I understand that and I appreciate that, what amazes me is that, and I said this yesterday, whenever government talk about trying to improve the quality of life of ordinary people, we sometimes hear opposition to that, but, some of those same voices will support a policy that allows our

government to spend \$10 billion a month to support a war. Where we supported that infrastructural bid that had a \$75 billion surplus. And selling us their oil at record prices, that --- that just boggles my mind.

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Like I said, I don't like mandates and you know, a lot of time, you know, even congress will offer mandates and except themselves, you know, and leave it up to the states to fund it. So, you know, I do appreciate your testimony, but the one thing that I'm hearing from you that I really appreciate is that you want to work with us to find as Representative Gergely said, middle ground, you know, because I believe it's there. But, while we have to continually try to work together we also have to recognize policies that do not sometimes allow us to do that --that do not allow you and when funding is cut from the federal government to the states that in turn makes us have less money to do things and you know, it seems that every branch even down to the citizens looks for --- look for the other person to fund it, yet, when we see what the taxpayers are paying they're making a return on the investment --- on their investment. So even while I appreciate your testimony and your eagerness to try to reach a middle ground here and I believe you're sincere because you come across that

way, you also have to look at policies that don't allow us sometimes to do that.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

When we get support, our own government can continue to throw money at a situation that seems to be out of hand and yet we hear nothing from the people who support or who do not support bills such as these or even the intent of a bill such as this, you know, I see some things here that can be approved, you know, you keep on mentioning a mandated payment for a coffee break, that's crazy, that's nonsense. mean well because I understand, you know, productivity. I'm one that --- and a lot of laborers would not do this, back in the mid '90s I had a contract that paid \$22 an hour, but, --- on paper they had this out, I --- mid '80s, but were they really making any money, no, because nobody brought them any of their money, the employers couldn't bring any work in. So we convinced our membership to take a \$5 an hour reduction in their pay rate and we guaranteed them that in a few years they would be right back where they were, that's because we started working as a partnership, management and labor as a partnership rather than as adversaries and I believe in a partnership. And I know they can work I'm an example of it, I've seen it, I have experience in it, so it's

nothing that someone told me, it's something that I
lived. But we have to have a trust between the two
groups in order to work together and your testimony I
feel your sincerity, I really do and don't get me --there are responsible employees --- employers, but, we
have to do something with irresponsible employers too.
And I'm not saying punish them the responsible ones
for the irresponsible ones but, working together we
just do it, thank you.

MR. SHIVERS:

Yes, sir.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Thanks, can I --- I just have a couple of things real quick. And one thing I just want to ask, now you're NFIB small business poll with 96 percent. That poll, is that conducted --- like what's the science on it, like who do you poll, is it your members, is it a general blanket, now what is the size of the businesses were polled on?

MR. SHIVERS:

Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Small business is kind of a largely defined term and you know, so ---.

MR. SHIVERS:

Actually, I mean, I'll give you guys a 1 good lean today, I mean, in terms of information. have been running small business polls, I think, for like over ten years now and I'm not sure the methodology, but if you go to 411sbfax.com, we have 5 been able to categorize every small business poll that we've done for the last 10, 12 years. And in fact, it's actually a very useful tool because it indexes it by issues and we've been talking about all kinds of things. They're national polls, this isn't just 10 11 Pennsylvania's specific data. But we do --- I 12 believe, we do member and nonmembers, don't hold me to that because I do think there's some that we open up 13 14 beyond our membership.

But there's also some really good facts and figures in there just generally, about what it takes to run a small business in Pennsylvania. So you have actually added an action item for me, when I get back to Harrisburg I'm going to send that link out to all of the generally assembly so that they have that information as well.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Well, that'll be --- that certainly would be very beneficial. Just the thing that I'm looking at is, I mean, when you say 96 percent provide

this yet we heard several stories yesterday of people who didn't have leave.

One woman told her story about how her and her daughter both didn't have --- I know you weren't here with us yesterday, but, neither of them had leave and you know, one or the other had to take a day off without pay to, you know, of anytime their --- that the granddaughter would --- her grandson, I believe, was ill and we had another story of someone who had, I guess, occurrences against them. Now out of those six occurrences, anytime they took time off was an occurrence, they would lose their job. So it's --- you know, if it's 96 percent --- that number just seems so large considering the number of stories we hear. And I don't know maybe those are all large employers maybe those aren't small businesses, we didn't ask them who they were working for at the time.

MR. SHIVERS:

Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

So maybe this is more of a large business than a small business problem, I don't know. I do want to move on into talking about the FMLA and the temporary care insurance. You as well said, you know, we don't want to mandate FMLA. FMLA's been

mandated since the '90s, now small businesses ---

MR. SHIVERS:

If employing 50 or more.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Yeah, now small businesses are not and this bill is not creating requirement for small businesses to provide FMLA to hold those jobs, we're not creating protection with House Bill 1386. This is an insurance fund so that, should your employer --- should one of your small business employers offer employee leave this --- it could be paid out of there but, there's no requirement in here saying that all employers have to offer FMLA. If you're not already under the federal bill, there's a federal law, then this is not going to be an issue.

Now, is there going to be a cost to it, yes, you know, it is an insurance program, there is going to --- the fees are coming out of a payroll tax, employer and employee contributions. So, yes there -- is there a cost, yes, but, is this going to be a new mandate on small business beyond the cost, no, there's no new mandate on small businesses that they offer any type of leave that is not already a requirement under FMLA.

I do have interest in question, I guess,

you mentioned something about business owners not
getting leave. Now, I know in here we define employer
--- employee as --- in the same way as defined under
the Unemployment Compensation law, I don't have a copy
of the UC law in front of me, is a small business --a business owner who does work for the company, are
they considered an employee under the Unemployment
Comp, I don't know if you would know the answer to
that?

MR. SHIVERS:

No, I mean, you know, employers are expressly --- you as an employer cannot collect unemployment if something happens and your business goes, you know, goes under.

I mean, there are certain, you know, situations where you can but by in large, no. And the reason, you know --- one of the reasons we're told is went out and look this guy is in control of their own destiny, they know what they're --- well, we're talking about a benefit here, I mean, your goal, where somebody may adopt a child and want to take that time to bond with that child, you know what, small employers do that all the time, small employers have families too. I mean, we're --- you know, small employers are not the 800 pound gorilla, you know,

1 they're the people that are sponsoring the little league, they're the ones that are sponsoring the pancake breakfast in our communities, you know, they're the ones that live within --- within our 5 neighborhoods, you know, they have families too and 6 they have loved ones, why can't they take advantage of, you know, of this benefit. And I guess the other question I have is --- I mean, if it were up to you what should an employer provide, should an employer provide health care or should an employer provide 10 family leave because right now you have 60 percent of 11 12 employers --- small employers are providing health care and now you're telling them, oh wait a minute we 13 want to mandate family leave. So which is more 14 15 important?

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Like I said, we're not mandating family leave, there's nothing in here mandating family leave ---.

MR. SHIVERS:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But, you're getting paid time off.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

We're not --- well, that's a separate bill, is the paid sick leave, this is not --- the employers you're talking about, small business 50 and

under, we're not mandating anything, if they want to offer it they can offer it, but, if they're not covered under FMLA we're not telling them they have to give anything up.

MR. SHIVERS:

But they're still subject to the taxes and the ---.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

They're subject to pay the fees and to surly offer any time --- you know, if business over 50 employees, yes, they're already required under FMLA and we're offering wage replacement for those employees taking FMLA. For the small employers though, you know, if --- it would still be option like it is now, to whether or not they want to do it, but if they choose to there would be a method for those people to recoup their wages, that's all this is.

This is an insurance program, you know, similar to unemployment compensation, this is insurance that it replaced wages for a person who is away from work because of a family medical emergency --- you know issue. So it ---.

MR. SHIVERS:

Is there any mention in --- just, I

mean, in terms of --- you know, what about you --- if

somebody does have vacation time or sick time accrued and ---?

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

You can require, I believe, in section

--- what, section four, subsection E, if employer --that they can require them to take vacation, I

believe, is up to one week of vacation can be required
prior to offering it, if they do offer vacation time.

There's also a one week waiting period prior to

becoming eligible for benefits, so that in the week
you're not eligible to collect until the second week

of leave. So yes there are requirements that you can
--- for the --- require someone to take vacation or
sick leave if it is offered by the employer prior to
recouping this and, you know, so, yeah, there are
requirements in there for that.

MR. SHIVERS:

And just remember, I mean, they're going to be administrative costs to doing this as well, because certainly the employer, you know, on a five person business you're going to be needing to keep track of employee records and when they're taking off and I mean, there's --- you know, if you look at the bureaucracy that is involved with the FMLA, I mean, we're basically taking that infrastructure --- well,

we're not calling it that we're taking that whole infrastructure and we're going to be thrusting that upon the small employer and saying good luck in managing this.

3

5

19

20

21

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Well, yeah, if the small employer chooses 6 7 It's not a requirement for them, again, to do so. it's still a choice for them, but, if they do offer it already, then yes, then they would be able, you know, they would pay on this and they would --- the person 10 11 would be able to recoup. But, you know, I mean, small 12 businesses, you know, there is no requirement, no new mandate really on this short of the employer-employee 13 14 contributions, you know as I said, this is paying for 15 wage replacement for a law that already exists on a federal level, so, I guess that's all my questions if 16 17 there's no one else? All right. Well, thank you, 18 Kevin.

MR. SHIVERS:

Hey, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

All right, next I'd like to the
microphone Senator Stephen Sweeney of the --- a Senate
Majority Leader from the New Jersey State Legislature
and I believe, the proud sponsor of the New Jersey

Family Temporary Care Act. So Senator Sweeney thank
you for coming over and I'm looking forward to hearing
about you're experiences with the New Jersey bill.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

2.4

Well, first I want to congratulate the House in Pennsylvania for taking up the issue, it's a very important issue. It was very difficult, in New Jersey it was around for 12 years. For 12 years they argued over it, I took the bill as a priority two years ago and it took me two years and a whole lot of negotiations to pass a bill.

You're going to hear from the business community that the world's going to come to an end, you know what I mean, it's they're not going to be able to function, they're not going to be able to, you know, administer or run their programs or their jobs, you know, you're going to hear all that. But there is a model in California and there's statistics in California that you can base on.

There hasn't been any abuse. California hasn't fallen into the, you know, the Pacific Ocean, they've actually, managed their program very well and we did a lot of things on our end to base the bill to correct the bill after California. Now, in New Jersey since the employers didn't want to contribute anything

to this bill, we made it 100 percent employee pay, 100
percent, but, with that then you can't exempt small
businesses. The --- and I mean down to two workers
businesses, because if I'm an employee and I am paying
a tax, you can call it a fee, you can call it whatever
you'd like to call it, but, if I'm paying into, just
like unemployment, I am eligible to collect, you know
what I mean.

And administratively it would be a nightmare to try to segregate because if I'm working for a large employer and then I go to work for a small employer, I qualified working for a large employer, then I got to a small employer and they don't have it. So it --- we --- the frustrating thing, I think you'll find this out is that, the business community will not work with you on this bill or any of these bills, they're just going to tell you all the things that are wrong with them, now, I haven't heard anything but, my experience in New Jersey. I'm prime sponsor of the Minimum Wage Law in New Jersey.

The world was going to come to an end then, all the businesses was going to run to Pennsylvania because Pennsylvania would never do minimum wage and Pennsylvania turned around and did minimum wage. You know, these are issues that need to

be taken up on state level because the federal
government's basically given up their responsibility
to deal with real issues like health care, paid family
leave, you know, important, important issues.

In New Jersey it's six weeks, you get up to \$524 a week, you don't get 12 weeks of the unpaid leave and then six weeks of paid leave, they run it together, so, that they're with, you know, the federal law. And like I said, if this was --- this was probably one of the biggest battles that we had faced in several years, Governor Corzine was very supportive of the bill which was helpful in getting its passage, even with that all said, with the Democrats in control in New Jersey, in the senate, with 23 votes, we had a 23/17 advantage, we passed it 21 to 17, the 21 I think 17 would, one Republican voting for the bill. So it was a very difficult bill to pass, it is 100 percent employee paid.

And like I said, as far as, you know, when I hear about and I did hear about how a lot of businesses do provide leave and honestly, a lot of businesses don't. And there's a lot of business owners that are very good with their employees, they're not --- they're not the enemy, that are willing to, you know, a lot of times you'll run into

certain circumstances where the business owner will adapt, you know, maybe they'll put a computer in your 3 house if you're a bookkeeper to adjust or let you work on the weekends or different hours because listen, this is up to 2/3 of your pay in New Jersey, it's not 100 percent, it's not, you know, the end all to be all 6 this is what kept surprising us. If you maxed out the benefit with --- it was \$3,000. So, you know what I mean, it's not like this was --- is the savior, this 10 was just to get you through. So I'm more than happy 11 to answer any of the questions or anything you want to 12 talk about with us. I could talk for quite some time 13 because as legislators, you understand when you tackle tough issues as this there's very strong feelings on 14 15 both sides. So I'd be happy to answer any questions 16 at all.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

I'll let the panel start, does anyone have questions for the Senator? Representative Gergely.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

Thank you. We welcome Senator Sweeney.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Thank you.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

When you say employees had a 100 percent contribution to this program it's not started yet; correct, it starts this ---?

SENATOR SWEENEY:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

20

21

22

23

week.

January 1st, 2009.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

So you're building up a --- and they already started a contribution?

SENATOR SWEENEY:

No, they won't start contributing until January 1st, 2009 and it won't be implemented, there's 12 a --- there's a, you know, a build up period. But the plan will not start until July, 1st. So we're going to --- everyone's going to contribute, so you're going to build up that contribution, you have enough money to start paying out. 16

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

18 Right, that's one of the questions that 19 --- and what is the rate of contribution?

SENATOR SWEENEY:

It's --- I think it's like 63 cents a

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

24 Sixty-three (63) cents a week and it's voluntary signup then; correct?

SENATOR SWEENEY:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

No, no this is mandatory.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

Every employee ---.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Every employee in the state of New Jersey will participate. Again, we want to --- the business community, I heard your bill where there's a --- there's a --- you know the business community is going to participate. In New Jersey they didn't want to. They said, you know, we don't want to pay for it. So we made it employee paid.

And also, I want to point one other thing out for small businesses. Unlike the paid federal leave --- Unpaid Federal Leave Act where they have to hold your job, we actually put a provision in our bill for small employers that there --- from 1 to 49 that they did not have to quarantee that job. So when you went to your employer and said I have to do this I have no choice the employer could say you might not have a job when you come back, if I find someone that can do the job. That was a very distasteful thing for me to do as a Democrat as a --- you know, just as someone that really believes in worker issues. But we 25 | had to recognize that small businesses do have certain

challenges and if they have to go out, then there should be some, you know, leeway for them because this is a serious decision being made.

But again, you know, I always argued with the small business owners when they were telling me this is what happens if your bookkeeper has a massive heart attack and is out for three months, do you close up? No, they're very creative smart people, they find ways to get the job done.

It might be them doing the work, it might be them working extra or working overtime what ever and what we told people in the small business community is by workers taking this paid leave you're not paying them, you have that salary freed up if you need to work overtime with workers or whatever, you know, you're not paying that worker, the employee is paying for the benefit himself.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

And once, I guess, this became part of the compromise over the two year period that you had, you know, taken on the bill yourself and started the negotiations. I assume it wasn't originally all 100 percent employee contribution; correct?

SENATOR SWEENEY:

For me it was, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

It was, okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

21

22

23

24

SENATOR SWEENEY:

It was 12 weeks when I started.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

Okay.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

8 Before --- when I started really working on this bill I had spoken to the business community 10 and --- you know and no matter how much there's a 11 negotiation or process, at the end of the day this is 12 a national issue for them. They are opposed to this. 13 You know, when New Jersey did paid family leave it 14 made new around the nation, you know, we're actually 15 the third state to pass it but we're the second state 16 to implement it because Washington State hasn't 17 figured out the mechanism yet on how to pull the 18 trigger. So, you know, the more states start to do 19 this, like minimum wage, the grounds will force the 20 federal government to deal with the issue.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

So this is a \$32.76?

SENATOR SWEENEY:

It's nothing.

25 <u>REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:</u>

And once --- you know, we're hearing a lot of feedback was contribution rate from employers et cetera, once you knew you were 100 percent employee contribution; what were their opposition at that point?

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY:

They couldn't function, it's a horrible thing to do, they provide their own leave and I said honestly, that's a great thing if you do.

In New Jersey, again, a worker has to use two weeks of personal time, if they have time, you'll find out 40 to 50 percent of the business don't provide workers with vacation or sick time, you know, they don't. It's a reality. But for companies that do, you have to use two weeks of your own time first before you can get to this.

So it's actually a four week paid program because you're off for two weeks and you're only eligible to be off six being paid. So again, it's --- you're going to hear, it's going to devastate business, but my argument has always been, the business community is very creative. Again, you have someone who passes away happens everyday in business, you have someone that gets sick everyday, you have people that quit everyday and the businesses don't

close up shop. They continue to go forward.

2

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

That's all I have, thank you, Senator. 3

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Representative Mantz.

REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ:

Senator, one quick question, your definition of the word sick in your legislation in New Jersey, are you talking basically about an individual or an employee who may have a contagious disease or is incapacitated, mentally or physically where the performance to be --- the duties of this employment ---.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Well, in my bill there has to --there's a component where there has to be a doctor certification, like if say, and again, you have to --we were actually talking about limit it to only New Jersey's doctors to get a certification from. But, if 22 my mother's sick in Michigan and say she's dying in 23 Michigan and a Michigan doctor says someone needs to be here to care for her. Well, you can't exclude other doctors, but there's a component where a doctor

has to certify and in New Jersey under our TDI,

Temporary Disability Insurance, we have very stiff

penalties for fraud and we are very aggressive and we

actually --- we criminalized, you know, the act of

fraud on Temporary Disability Insurance and we've

filed those same penalties that we have for Temporary

Disability Insurance and extended them to this paid

family leave to protect it.

So what it basically comes down to is that a licensed physician has to issue a letter saying that this leave is required or necessary.

REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ:

To find out the choice of a licensed physician, be for the employers or the employees or normally a matter of collective bargaining with that stuff.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

The employer has a right to challenge, you know what I mean, the employer has that right, listen, we don't view employers as bad people this is just something this distasteful they don't believe in it.

They don't believe in a 40 hour work week, you know what I mean, they, you know, you know, there's reasons why we have child labor laws, you

1 know. But the employer has that right to challenge
2 the employee's doctor, to send to another doctor, you
3 know, they have those rights --- we built a lot of
4 protections in the bill on our own because the
5 business community in New Jersey refused to even
6 negotiate, discuss the bill with me, you know.

This entire process was me

negotiating against myself and I got to a point where

I got tired of guessing and saying, well, instead 12

weeks we'll do ten, instead of ten we'll do six, we'll

do this, we'll do that, you know, at the end of the

day, it was like look I'm giving you every possible

protection.

And for the small employers and this was really tough and we had our Attorney General review it, that they didn't have to guarantee, it is legal and the AFL-CIO and the workers groups were very upset with me for putting that in there, but there's no guarantee for a small, you know, for a small employer to hold a job for an employee.

REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ:

Thank you very much.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Anyone else, Gene.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO:

Hi Senator, how you doing?

SENATOR SWEENEY:

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

How are you, sir?

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO:

Welcome and I just was curious about maybe a little bit of a political aspect, did you ever feel on one level that you were working on a bill that you had kind of like both sides angry at you at the same time, and you were wondering what you were really trying to do?

SENATOR SWEENEY:

12 Yeah, Gene. I'm sorry, I said Gene. Yes, absolutely, we had a --- on numerous occasions. 13 You know, I'm a labor leader in New Jersey to start 14 15 I'm head of the Iron Workers Union, actually, 16 now in Southeastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey and 17 the AFL-CIO was very upset with me because I kept that 18 clause, in fact, I'm the one that put the clause in 19 that there was no quarantee of employment for small employers. So I was fighting with my friends and I 20 21 was fighting with the business community and it was 22 --- we weren't trying to --- sometimes you can 23 negotiate and find a happy medium, as you know, 24 sometimes you can't. There's never going to be a happy medium on this bill.

Right now, I just read where New Jersey 1 Business and Industry Association is actually holding seminars to teach their businesses to deal with paid 3 family leave, you know what I mean? And they will and they'll deal with it and it's going to work fine, as it has in California and I would advise anyone if ---6 New Jersey's hasn't started yet, but look at California's numbers. There's real statistics. It's not like, you know, we said to the Business and Industry community, as we were arguing this, show me 10 the fraud in California, show me the business groups 11 12 that could --- you know, show me facts, don't give us words, give me proof and I'll change the bill. 13

They could never give me any proof, it didn't happen. If there wasn't a state that didn't have this law in place, that would be one thing, but we actually had something to draw from, you know what I mean, to measure against. So you're --- this is not a win. It's a win for workers, but, it's not a win if you're trying to satisfy one group or another.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO:

Was the vote in the assembly is as close as in the senate?

SENATOR SWEENEY:

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes. And you know, we had, honestly, we

1 had two republicans in the assembly vote for the bill after it had passed. You know, it's like anything and as legislators you understand this, there's sometimes when people will vote, you know, to make some people happy, but it's after the hard work was done and the 41 votes were cast. Listen, there was democrats who 6 didn't vote for this bill, you know what I mean, this is a very emotional bill. I had three democrat senators wouldn't vote for the bill. I had one republican senator in the senate vote for the bill and 10 11 I mean, he showed real courage, his name's Bill 12 Baroni, he showed real courage in voting for this bill. And they ran radio ads and conservative groups 13 14 really beat him up pretty good and he voted for it. 15 We had to vote for it twice in the 16 senate because of procedural issues, we had an 17 amendment in one house and it came --- so this 18 gentleman, this senator had to vote twice against his

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO:

There were attempts to put amendments on it to try to weaken, I guess, I would assume ---.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

19

20

21

22

23

24

poor constituency.

Very much so and none of those were successful and again, it passed 21 votes in the senate

and it passed the assembly with 43 votes but, I don't count the last two votes because that basically, they were thrown up there after the bill had passed, you know.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO:

Okay. Again, Senator, thank you for being here today.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No, thank you for having me.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Yeah, and I just --- I'm just ask a couple of questions. I appreciate some of your insight, you know, as the proud sponsor of the bill here in Pennsylvania I certainly, I think you're experience is definitely very telling of some things that we can look at for our legislation and I think we started off from a strong, you know, similar to what you did a very --- much stronger perspective expecting that if it goes forward it will probably get weakened in some ways through the negotiation process. And we do have a lot of similar components that you talked about, things like the requirement of using vacation and sick days prior to being able to claim. We are starting off with the 12 week, as you did. So there are --- do you have some of the other requirements

such as, if they're eligible for unemployment compensation this would not apply if they are --- if there are other families members who are able to take care of them, then they would not be eligible to take care of the ill person and, you know, I know those are a couple of other things that we have included in ours.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

No, we don't have that, if --unemployment's a different fund, you know, we --- see
we have temporary disability in New Jersey too, I
don't know if Pennsylvania has that.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

No, I just asked if you could explain that a little bit.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Temporary Disability is a program that if you get sick, have a heart attack, you know, something happens that's not work related, well, there's a fund that we pay tax into, the employer and the employee pays into it and it provides, you know, like 2/3 of your income up to it's \$800 I think now, that you would get while you're on temporary disability.

In fact, I had a friend of mine that

lives in New Jersey, but always works in Pennsylvania and his employer is a Pennsylvania employer and had a massive heart attack and he was telling me that he was getting ready to lose his house and I said why aren't you on temporary disability, he said Pennsylvania doesn't have that. New Jersey's one of, I think, a half a dozen states that has temporary disability and they've had it since the '40s. So they've had it since the 1940s, it's a wonderful program.

So unemployment now, we don't --- and as far as --- since I'm paying, since I, the employee, am paying 100 percent, you know, it's not up to --- say I have three siblings, we might be 24/7, you know what I mean, we're rotating, we're all taking it for that reason. We also have it where it's six weeks or 42 individual days. So that you could schedule --- but they have to be scheduled with the employer also, you know what I mean, it's not something you just come in and say, I'm going to take off tomorrow. You know, it's for someone who's dealing with chemotherapy or long range healthcare.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Yeah, and I can also see what you're understanding of it, you're saying is, because it is entirely employee funded that --- how you had to take

that down to include the small business workers that they break down to two employees because if you're paying for it, you should receive the benefit of it, certainly and I guess, the other --- the lack of protection for those jobs and you know, is --- you know, at least my understanding, currently the way it 6 would be FMLA at the federal level would --- where their jobs would be protected, you know, even if there was a private --- there is an employer option to give, you know, to allow me to take it, there's no 10 11 requirement though that job is waiting for someone 12 with a small business anyhow. So really it wasn't that you took away protection, you didn't add that 13 additional protection if the FMLA does it already. 14

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Exactly.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

So, well, certainly you --- it's very interesting to hear your input and as I move forward with pushing this session and most likely in the future sessions, I think we can learn a lot from your experiences.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

I would be happy to share any information --- the volumes of information that we've 25

gone through and so you can see how the bill actually evolved and you know, honestly, it's a good bill and it's a fair bill and even though the business community wouldn't work with us on the bill we listened to them in advance and included all their concerns and after we did all the things that they wanted us to do, really at the end of the day, the answer was going to be no, there was no satisfying. You know what I mean, there's never --- and if you think that there's any chance of satisfying them, 10 11 well, you might as well stop now, you know what I 12 mean, because it's not going to happen and when you take some things away that the working side wants 13 14 you're not going to make them happy either and that's 15 why --- Actually, I knew I had a good bill because everybody was mad at me at the end, you know, when you 16 17 do that then you know you've done a lot, as I think 18 as, John went up here and announced. You know when 19 all is mad, you know you did well.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's very true, but as you said this is a great bill for employees. This is definitely important because, you know, people need to take this leave, you know, whether it's for a new child or a sick family member. To be without those wages is, you

know, often times prohibitive for the workers.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

2.4

Well, how many times can someone just take off? How many times can someone just take off for weeks at a time without any money coming in, without your credit card bill and your gas bills, with the economy as it is, you know, it really is a --- this is a fairness thing and the fact that the workers are willing. And we polled it in New Jersey and I didn't do the bill because of that, but 78 percent of the workers, knowing they were going to pay for this, supported it.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Senator, it's great to see the legislation was so well supported and I appreciate your advice about the business community and I think we still have some of that today that, you know, certainly there's going to be some push back to it, but, people can somewhat settle with what you did to New Jersey, I think it could at least make it a little bit more palatable and a little, you know, ease that fight a little bit.

Though I'm sure like you said we're not going to ever get their overwhelming approval. I think Representative Gergely had one more question.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yep and this is ---. Senator, I'm kind of shifting gears from 1386. The other bill we're having this hearing on is 1155 which is a Healthy Family's Act, paid sick days and I don't know if your guys have embraced that in the State of New Jersey yet.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Not yet, but you've given me an idea.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

They're sitting right back there, they'll talk to you. One of the questions that I had, it will impact the workers in Pennsylvania in terms of unions and bargaining units. Well, we had a discussion with the laborers saying that they don't 16 actually negotiate paid sick days because they don't take them into their contract. So I was looking to you to be aware of that as a business ---.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Well, honestly, that's something I would love to have as a business representative of a union, we don't get sick days.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

Right.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

You know, my guys, when it rains they
don't get paid, if they're sick and they don't go into
work, they don't get paid, so, if there's a benefit
like that would be a wonderful opportunity for --because we can't negotiate those things, you know,
we're temporary workers that's what we employ, we're
temporary workers when you need us we're there, when
we're gone --- when you don't we're gone. So to have
a benefit like that it would be a wonderful thing for
our workers.

REPRESENTATIVE GERGELY:

I'm glad you gave your insight on that.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Thank you, Senator, I really appreciate you coming and joining us.

SENATOR SWEENEY:

Thank you, good luck.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Thank you. I guess, we'll move forward with our next speaker Steffany Stern from the National Partnership for Women and Family.

MS. STERN:

Hello, I'm Steffany Stern. I'm a Work

and Family Policy Analyst at the National Partnership for Woman and Families. The National Partnership is a non-profit and non-partisan advocacy group dedicated to promoting fairness in the workplace, access to quality healthcare and policies that help workers in the U.S. meet the dual responsibilities of work and family.

One of our proudest accomplishments is leading a nationwide movement to ensure that all workers have access to paid sick days to use when they are ill or they need to care for a sick family member. We lead a broad, diverse coalition of close to 150 groups dedicated to advocating for paid sick days at the federal level and we also support advocates working at the state and city levels to advance paid sick days through their legislative bodies or through the ballot.

Just to give you some background, we're also the organization that helped address the Family and Medical Leave Act and led the coalition that lobbied for its passage for over, I believe, eight years. I'm here to speak on House Bill 1155, but I also am able to answer some questions generally on House Bill 1386. We keep track of what's going on in all of the states related to both paid sick days and

paid family and medical leave.

It's an honor to be here today to testify in support of House Bill 1155 which is groundbreaking and yet very modest legislation to allow Pennsylvania workers at larger businesses to earn up to 6 and 1/2 paid sick days per year and then smaller business employees to earn up to 3 and 1/4 days. This bill is an excellent step towards updating our labor standards to better reflect the reality of today's working families and would allow Pennsylvania to strengthen its reputation as a leader and addressing the needs of working families and promoting economic security.

Chances are each of us are going to get sick or need to take care of a sick family member this year, but not all of us will have the option of taking time off work to get better. You heard yesterday through many of the witnesses that in the U.S. today nearly half of private sector workers don't have a single paid sick day to use for themselves or to care for a sick family member and in Pennsylvania, 2.2 million people which is 46 percent of your workforce, are not able to take paid sick days when they're ill. And the situation is even worse for low income workers, more than three in four have no paid sick

days at all.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 I'd like to share with you a quick story 3 shared on our online rally for healthy families. constructed a website which allowed people to visit and learn more about paid sick days policies and share 5 their stories about why they need paid sick days or 6 how they think it's important. We got one from Natalie in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, who said: Paid sick days are a huge blessing I can't afford to get sick from my co-workers who do not have paid sick 10 11 days. I have a son and I am a single mom, so when I 12 get sick everything is affected. We all get sick. Having to work when you're sick isn't good for 13 individuals their families, their co-workers or the 14 15 public.

Currently, no state or federal law insures that workers have paid sick days when they need them. In 2006 San Francisco became the first locality in the country to guarantee paid sick days for all of its workers and since then a national paid sick days movement has grown.

Washington D.C. became the second jurisdiction to pass the Paid Sick Days Bill just in March of 2008 and this was the first bill that was passed to guarantee paid safe days for people to use

when they are victims of domestic violence or they need to recover from sexual assaults or stalking and need to seek services related to those problems.

Legislators in more than a dozen states and on Capitol Hill this year are advocating for paid sick days initiatives and we're predicting several --- we're hearing from several advocates in several newspapers that they're going to launch campaigns in 2009.

The National Partnership is leading a coalition in support of the federal Paid Sick Days Bill, the Healthy Families Act. Our diverse coalition includes children's civil rights, women's disability faith based community and antipoverty groups as well as labor unions, health agencies and leading researchers at top economic institutions. We work with 9to5, ACORN, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the AFL-CIO, the National Organization for Women and many, many other large well respected organizations.

We've all come together in support of this bill because millions of working people are being forced to choose between taking care of a sick child or family member and losing a day's pay or even a job. In a nation that values families, no worker should

have to make this impossible choice.

Americans want to be both responsible workers and care for their family members. In 78 percent of today's families, both parents work for pay. The typical couple in America now works close to 90 hours per week, but our policies lag desperately behind and families are struggling as a result. We can and must do better and we will if we truly value families.

You heard a great deal yesterday and today already about how paid sick days are good for women, children, seniors, and our public health. My testimony contains a lot of these points, but I'm going to skip ahead to one of my favorite things to emphasize that the public overwhelmingly supports paid sick days.

The likelihood of being sick or having a child who is going to be sick does not depend on whether you live in a red or blue or purple state. So establishing a minimum standard of paid sick days deserves bipartisan support and it has it. Poll after poll has found tremendous support for paid sick days and proposals like House Bill 1155. A 2007 nationwide poll found that 89 percent of voters favor a basic labor standard of paid sick days and support is very

strong across party lines: 94 percent of democrats, 90
percent of independents and 83 percent of republicans
support paid sick days. And there's going to be
another nationwide poll released, I believe, tomorrow
or next week that demonstrates, again, resounding
support across the board. We also have regional
support, support from both men and women and support
from people across income levels.

In concluding I'll just say that this debate is really about what we value in this nation. If we want healthy families and a strong economy, if we care about the well-being and economic security of our families we will establish a minimum standard of paid sick days. In Pennsylvania you can do that by passing House Bill 1155.

Guaranteeing access to paid sick days is the next step in bringing our outdated workplace policies back in sync with the realities of today's working families. Paid sick days are the next minimum labor standard the nation needs.

Momentum is building. At the federal level the senate has held a hearing on the Healthy Families Act in the help committee and is headed for a hearing in the House of Representatives. We have 24 senate co-sponsors on the Healthy Families Act and 103

House co-sponsors. And thus far in 2008, Paid Sick
Days Bill has been considered in legislatures in
Alaska, California, Connecticut, The District of
Columbia, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota,
North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, West
Virginia, Milwaukee and Philadelphia. Many of these
initiatives have progressed through the legislatures
and two of them Ohio and Milwaukee, will be put before
the voters on the ballot on Election Day.

But we urgently need a state to step forward and enact the first statewide standard guaranteeing all its workers paid sick days.

Pennsylvanians need you to make passage of House Bill 1155, a priority in this legislative session. Members of the Committee, I thank you for the opportunity to participate in this important discussion and I will take any questions you have.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Just a quick question and I don't know if I remember it statistically what you had, but we heard earlier, an earlier testifier that in Pennsylvania now there's 75 percent of small business owners already provide their workers with some type of paid sick leave. The statistics or the percentages that you used, I think, were much lower on a national

level? 1 2 MS. STERN: Well, there's a difference between the 3 stats on the proportion of businesses that provide it and the proportion of employees that are getting it 5 are different because, obviously, the larger 6 businesses are employing a larger percentage of the workers, but I would have to look at, --- you said 75 percent? 10 REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS: 11 Seventy-five (75) percent. 12 MS. STERN: And then there's a 96 percent from the 13 14 NFIB study. 15 REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS: 16 There was a 96 percent of small business 17 will offer flexible working hours for their employees. 18 MS. STERN: 19 Oh. 20 REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS: 21 Seventy-five (75) percent of small 22

business owners provide their workers with some type of paid sick leave here in Pennsylvania.

MS. STERN:

23

24

25

I would love to take a look at that

study and to check out how they --- how they define

paid sick leave and take a look at the methodology

because what we're hearing more --- you know national

statistics provided by the government, the U.S. Bureau

because that it is say that the --- that only half of

the work force in the private sector, has paid sick

days and that it is less likely for smaller business

employees to have them, part time employees to have

them, lower income --- lower wage workers to have them

and --- so that's sort of the demographics?

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

12 Yes.

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. STERN:

So it does sort of go against what the Bureau of Labor Statistics is saying.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Who is the prime sponsor of the Healthy Family Act in Washington; do you know?

MS. STERN:

It is Senator Edward Kennedy from

Massachusetts on the senate side. On the House side

it's Representative Rosa Delora from Connecticut.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

And is that bill --- you said that's just had, basically, had the --- in process of the

County Committees in the House on the Senate?

MS. STERN:

Right, we had a hearing last year in the senate and we are looking forward to a hearing being scheduled at some point soon in the House. We've been working on the a lot of different issues, so, we haven't been able to schedule that yet. And it has been addressed by the --- by Representative Woolsey's committee on the House side.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Okay. Thank you, Steffany.

REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

Thank you, Steffany, again, it brings up the statistics that I brought about to Kevin from the National Federation of Independent Business, how far apart they are, your statistics versus their level and at the same paragraph, you --- that labor relations, I think has to be brought forth, but, you said the statistics nationally --- so that we can have a better grasp for this bill.

Initially, --- the question I have is, of all the states, cities and federally that have proposed this, how different are the proposals that you've seen, are they pretty much all similar, like, our Pennsylvania Bill is similar to the Ohio Bill to

the California Bill; can you go a little bit about that?

MS. STERN:

Sure. Many of the bills do have a very similar method of accrual and I offer a similar number of days. So, you know, like in Pennsylvania, workers earn one hour of paid time per 40 hours worked and that's sort of across the board how these models have been set up, because then workers are sort of earning it and they very much deserve that paid time off for all those hours that they've put in and then the cap just sort of differs around the nation.

Act offers seven paid sick days a year and several of the bills that have been introduced around the country offer seven paid sick days. Some of them are a little more generous. In San Francisco all the workers get nine days and some of the other bills that are moving right now are more generous and offer nine, but many of them closer around seven, I think, just because it's sort of a catchy number.

REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

Ohio's a referendum?

MS. STERN:

It's yes on the ballot.

REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

And that's just a yes we want it, no we don't or assignment of days?

MS. STERN:

It is --- the model is seven days per year and that one does not include the domestic violence but it's the same --- it's to care for a sick family member or to recover from treatment or to seek diagnosis and treatment and that's --- yeah, it's just yes or no.

REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

I was reading your testimony, you skipped a lot, it was safe days in D.C.; correct?

MS. STERN:

Right.

REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

How many of the legislatures have a domestic violence bill and a --- just a paid sick day 19 bill? I know we don't have it. Is there many of the states that have two categories, two bills?

MS. STERN:

That have two bills before them right

23 now?

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

25 Yeah.

MS. STERN:

2.4

Well, some of the Paid Sick Days Bills
that have been introduced just sort of added that as
an extra piece of coverage and I have to do a count to
see how many of the ones that are currently being
considered, have that definition in there. A fair
amount of them do. Some states already have those
laws I don't know if you do in Pennsylvania, that
allow people to take job protective time off to seek
services related to domestic violence? No, you don't
have that. And this would also offer wage replacement
when you need to do that. But that's another popular
bill that's coming up because we do hear businesses
saying that it does cost them a lot of money, domestic
violence related incidents in the work place.

REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

All right. We'll move to our final speakers of the day which would be versus Pennsylvania AFL-CIO.

MR. KEATING:

Good morning my name is Russell Keating and with me is Michael Steffen and we are staff representatives for the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO.

I extend the greetings of President Bill George and Secretary Treasurer Rich Bloomingdale to all of you and on their behalf, thank you for this opportunity to address House Bill 1155, which we're prepared to address.

I would like to thank Chairman Belfanti
Chairman DiGirolamo, Committee Members and Committee
Staff for having this hearing and looking at such an
important matter that improves the quality of life for
so many people.

I'm here today on behalf of the affiliated Labor Organizations of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO, which represent over 900,000 workers in diverse occupations, who together with their families, contribute to the vitality of Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania AFL-CIO commends State
Representative Marc Gergely for promoting paid sick
leave and for introducing House Bill 1155 that we
think is a bill that benefits employees and employers.

House Bill 1155 shares many similarities to paid leave statutes adopted by the District of Columbia and San Francisco. Likewise, House Bill 1155 reflects the intent of legislation that United States Senator Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts, has introduced in the United States Senate.

Paid sick leave has a significant impact on the relationship between workers' morale, productivity and profits. Paid sick leave fosters profitability by raising the employee morale and thus their productivity and lowering production costs.

Sick and injured employees without paid sick leave are left with the choice of working while they are sick and injured or not working and risking the loss of their jobs. Likewise, sick and injured employees without paid sick leave are left with the choice of nursing their sick and injured family members or again, risking the loss of their jobs.

Such desperate choices do not boost employees' morale. And such desperate choices stifle productivity and profits in other ways. Employees who work while they are sick risk the health of other workers. Also, workers who work while sick and injured typically perform noticeably below their maximum proficiencies, and consequently productivity lags and profitability languishes.

Workers who lose their jobs because they are too sick and injured to work suffer the many setbacks of unemployment, and their former employers suffer the cycle of high employee turnover and rising costs of constantly hiring and training new employees.

Other states' studies show paid sick leave, reduces workplace illnesses, reduces production costs, increases worker retention, increases productivity and, ultimately, increases profitability.

A recent institute for Women's Policy
Research study found that providing paid sick leave in
Ohio would yield a net savings of more than \$1 per
worker per week. Consequently, Ohio is another state
considering paid sick leave legislation.

Bureau of Labor Statistic data shows as of 2005, almost half or approximately 42 percent of private sector workers are not eligible for paid sick leave. These and most other workers who are not eligible for paid sick leave typically are lower paid workers. Ironically, it is more costly for employers to provide paid sick leave to higher paid employees. According to the United States Department of Labor, on average it cost about double the amount of money per man hour to provide paid sick leave for management and upper pay scale employees than to provide paid sick leave to employees on the lower end of the pay spectrum.

Other studies have also shown that people who work in low paid positions in general have more medical issues. This may become a spiral down effect

for employees, and many times it does. Waiters, waitresses, hotel and resort staff, and other service 3 industry employees are the most prevalent group of employees who are not eliqible for paid sick leave. So this is a vested interest for yourself and your family. A hypothetical question, would you like 6 yourself and your family to receive services from persons who are working while they are sick because they must either do so or risk losing their jobs or would it be better for your customers and ultimately 10 11 your business for you, as a restaurant owner, to be 12 the cause of your sick employees coming to work and possible infecting your customers, or let your 13 employees take sick leave to enable them to convalesce 14 15 which in turn enables you to prevent possible contagion for your customers? 16 17 Workers recognize without business, there 18 are no jobs. We actually believe the more profitable 19 the business the more jobs to be created. 20 Naturally, we believe profitability significantly depends on workers' morale and health. Businesses 21 22 that properly care for their employees improve the morale of their employees, contribute to public health 23

and safety, and provide help and hope to those who

24

25 most need support.

affects the issue of the workers' rights. Too often employees are faced with losing their jobs so they can take care of themselves and their family members. I'm not implying every business does this, and we commend and respect those businesses that do provide for their employees, but there must be an overall standard that says, we care about the workers of this Commonwealth.

I leave you with one last thought, this Commonwealth has several times been the leading state on an array of issues such as the Pennsylvania Health Care Cost Containment Council, which has been called an example for all to follow. You have a choice here to be the first state to act the issue of paid sick leave, act on the issue of paid sick leave. You can show this country that when it comes to all workers' rights, Pennsylvania cares about our workers and recognizes their needs. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

Thank you, Russell, any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE:

With the many relations you have, as we move this forward I'm hoping we can continue to gain momentum working with yourselves on how we can achieve this. Are you finding success working with other

states with the coalition from AFL-CIO is going to be building --- to make this happen, you know, in interdiction, continued discussion even on the federal level with Senator Kennedy's bill?

MR. KEATING:

Yes, we --- our information --- we share with other state federations and also, naturally, AFL-CIO, on an issue like this we do try to coalesce and bring together all of the support groups, not just within the labor movement, but all other organizations that exist to, you know, improve the quality of life for workers and their families. So we will, in Pennsylvania, continue to pursue this and offer all the support that we can on behalf of your bill and we will be doing that.

REPRESENTATIVE:

I think this is similar to momentum when we started the discussion about minimum wage and as we continue to build that momentum with the add ons and the coalitions and many, many groups had their voice and say so and it's always a pleasure to have you be in the forefront of advocating these issues on behalf of working families in Pennsylvania and thank you.

MR. KEATING:

Thank you. Look forward to working with

you.

REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS:

All right. Well, I thank you, Russ, and, Mike, for coming out and I guess that can double conclude our --- I just want to thank everyone for coming out and participating and all of our testifiers and I think we've learned a lot of good information about both these bills and we'll continue to work on and improve them and make them even stronger to help all of our workers here in Pennsylvania and with that said, this meeting is adjourned.

HEARING CONCLUDED AT 11:54 A.M.

Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc. (814) 536-8908