

**PA12-051**

SB0194

Children	197-200, 202-207, 321-329, 351-357, 414-415	28
House	6268-6289	22
<u>Senate</u>	<u>1947-1953, 2033-2035</u>	<u>10</u>
		<b>60</b>

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**SELECT  
COMMITTEE  
ON  
CHILDREN  
PART 1  
1 – 318**

**2012  
INDEX**

So there's a lot of things that, you know, certainly we need to think through. And that's why I was interested in knowing if there's any other states that already have this in law, what is the impact -- enforcing, information, that's getting it out there to the consumers? Again, first and foremost is the safety of our public service officials. There is just no question about that and I can't imagine anyone who would disagree with that. But we also want to make sure that everyone is properly informed of the legislation so that it's properly carried out. So un -- unless you have something to add to that.

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: I -- I would only say that I'm a proponent for education of the public and if that means labeling the box and taking other steps, I don't -- I -- I would certainly support that.

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you for your testimony. Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. URBAN: Thank you. Are there any other questions for the Chief? Seeing none. Thank you so much for your testimony and thank you for being here -

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Thank you for (inaudible.)

REP. URBAN: -- for the press conference, Chief, really appreciate it.

Next on our list is Michelle Noehren from the Permanent Commission on the Status of Women. And she is testifying on two bills, I believe, 5218 and 194.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: Good afternoon, Senator Gerratana, Representative Urban and members of

the committee. My name's Michelle Noehren from the Permanent Commission on the Status of Women. And we're here today in support of two bills, House Bill 5218 and Senate Bill 194.

We're very happy to be here. We don't get to come before you very often because our purview really is women over the age of 18. But the two bills we're here to support today have a great impact on mothers in particular.

House Bill 5218, AN ACT CONCERNING TOXIC FIRE RETARDANTS IN CHILDREN'S PRODUCTS, would ban the use of toxic Tris chemicals that are used in products for children under the age of three. A new report called Hidden hazard -- Hazards in the Nursery discovered that many of the products mothers commonly use with their babies contain this chemical. The products they tested included breast feeding support pillows, car seats and diaper changing pads. As a new mother myself, I was upset about this news on a personal level because I own or have been using many of these products.

While there are clear reasons to ban the use of this chemical in order to protect the health and development of our children, it's also important that mothers have the ability to purchase products for their children that are safe. Most moms have no idea that toxic chemicals are being used in common baby products.

As an example, many moms choose to breast feed their babies as the way to support the development of a healthy immune system. And at the same time they may unknowingly be exposing their new born child to toxic chemicals found in common nursing pillows.

So we applaud your attention to the use of toxic chemicals in children's products because parents should be able to be confident that the products that they buy and give their children are safe.

And the second bill we're here in support of today is Senate Bill 194, AN ACT CONCERNING THE POSTPONEMENT OF JURY DUTY FOR BREAST FEEDING MOTHERS. I think we would all agree jury duty is an important civic responsibility that all citizens should be ready to participate in. However, in mothers that are breastfeeding and/or expressing milk by pumping, jury duty can present a challenge.

For very new mothers, many lactation consultants suggest not switching back and forth between breast and bottle until a good rhythm of breast feeding has been established in order to avoid any confusion. This means that mothers don't have -- that some mothers don't have the option of pumping and must be physically present to breast feed their baby, which is a challenge if serving on jury duty.

Additionally, staying in a court room for hours at a time can cause physical pain to a breast feeding mother who is used to expressing milk at certain intervals throughout the day. Breast feeding requires a serious commitment and interruptions in her schedule can have a big impact on a mother.

Senate Bill 194 would ease these challenges and concerns by allowing the jury administrator more flexibility in granting a postponement of jury duty to breast feeding mothers. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, 12 other states currently exempt breast feeding mothers from jury duty. And

those are identified in my written testimony that you have in front of you.

So thank you for your attention to these matters and for the opportunity to provide testimony on behalf of women in Connecticut. With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

REP. URBAN: Thank you, Michelle, and thank you again for coming with your baby to our press conference. We really appreciate it.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: And I should mention that we also submitted testimony on behalf of Christa Allard who has a ten-month-old daughter in support of the breast feeding bill as well.

REP. URBAN: Excellent. Thank you for your testimony on both of these bills. Are there any questions? Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you very much, Michelle. This is kind of a new topic for me so forgive me if I'm asking some questions that have been asked, maybe in the past. But when you're talking about these breast feeding support pillows and you're being exposed to this carcinogen. How -- how is it - - how are you exposed? I mean, like in a car seat, for example, it may be contained within the car seat and that's all sealed and everything. How -- how are you exposed to it in a pillow?

HB 5218

MICHELLE NOEHREN: That's a really good question. My understanding and some other people may be able to answer this better than me is that particles come out from the product into the air. And then your kids are often exposed to this because they're the ones that are playing

17

March 1, 2012

tmj/gbr SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN

2:30 P.M.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: Yes.

REP. WOOD: Why would it have been banned and come back -- be allowed to come back into products?

MICHELLE NOEHREN: That's a very good question.

REP. WOOD: Okay. Next question. Well -- can I, I mean we're going to need an answer to that at some point -

REP. URBAN: Actually, it was voluntarily withdrawn in the 70s because there were problems with it being mu -- mutagenic. So they withdrew it before the EPA banned it. So now it's back, yes.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: (Inaudible.)

REP. URBAN: Yeah, that was my reaction, too.

REP. WOOD: Okay. On the breast feeding. Having breast fed three kids, two about eight, ten months, I certainly support this. But I'm not sure I agree with up to 12 months and I wonder if there's flexibility in your mind? Because 12 months is a long time to be exempt from jury duty, to do our duty, so to speak, and wondered if, you know, six to eight months, would -- would be amenable to you?

SB194

MICHELLE NOEHREN: Well, a lot of mothers do breast feed past 12 months. And really, what this bill would do is give the administrator the flexibility to give up to 12 months. They don't actually get the whole 12 months, it's dependent upon the situation.

REP. WOOD: Right, but when a child -- when a baby, infant, whatever they are at that point, is eight months old, you're only feeding the child

two to three times a day so expressing milk is not a hardship. And most women if they're working have gone -- well gone back to work and are used to the routine of expressing their milk.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: I see what you're saying, but from, I guess, my own personal experience, I have a nine-month-old child and I still feed her about six times a day and I know other mothers that feed more frequently than that. It just depends on the schedule that the baby gets on. And for women who aren't pumping at all, even at eight or nine months, which is the case for some women, I think it would be difficult for them.

REP. WOOD: Right, but so many women are in the work force if they have gone back to work at this point.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: That's true.

REP. WOOD: So -- and at six to eight times a day at eight months is -- I -- I find that unusual, given the experience I've had with myself and friends breast feeding.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: I think-- well, it's different for everybody.

REP. WOOD: So I think we'd need some statistics on that. I -- I certainly support this idea -

MICHELLE NOEHREN: (Inaudible).

REP. WOOD: -- in this legislation but I -- I -- 12 months I'm a little troubled with.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: Okay.

19

March 1, 2012

tmj/gbr SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN

2:30 P.M.

REP. WOOD: But, thank you very much. Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. URBAN: Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you for your testimony. I just have some questions regarding S.B. 194. Do you know how much of a problem this has been in the State of Connecticut?

REP. WOOD: That's a great question. Actually, there is going to be someone testifying later from the Connecticut Breast Feeding Coalition who should be able to answer that. I do believe that in the past couple of years there have been some cases that have come up, which is why this bill is being brought before the committee. But I don't know the specifics of each of those cases.

REP. REBIMBAS: Okay. Because I personally believe that the bill is a good bill with good intent. I just hesitate on, once again, the implications that this bill may have.

Because being familiar with the Judicial system quite well, I can't imagine anyone that would be insensitive to a mother that would actually show up on the morning of jury duty and indicating what their challenges are in properly serving for jury duty and the mere fact of showing up may even in fact provide them with having been served. So my concern is I would like to hear exactly the number of people or the experiences of someone actually being forced to have to sit there and serve who had properly informed the judicial officials regarding their challenges regarding breast feeding.

The other concern is, again, the intent of the bill I don't think reaches maybe necessarily all the people that could benefit from it. And I think you brought it out in your testimony beautifully that people do breast feed beyond the 12 months.

The other thing as well, understanding the judicial system is already sensitive to these issues, nor would I imagine any attorney choose someone to serve on a jury that had these restrictions because quite frankly they wouldn't be able to serve there, sitting down for hours listening to testimony, because they obviously have to remove themselves either to directly feed the baby or to be pumping. So it's an impossibility for them to be chosen to serve on the jury.

One of the other concerns I would have is if someone was fortunate enough to be a mother and was breast feeding at the time, but has chosen to already go out in the work force and was working part time or full time, but yet still had the option to say, "But I'm not going to serve because I've got that option not to serve." That is also another concern of mine.

So although I believe the legislation in and of itself seems very responsible, very appropriate, I just want to hear more testimony that it's actually a problem that needs addressing. Or if it's not a problem, but certainly a very good social issue to bring to the forefront.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: Absolutely. And I also believe there is a mother here who's going to testify who had a -- an experience that we're talking about.

21

March 1, 2012

tmj/gbr SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN

2:30 P.M.

REP. REBIMBAS: Wonderful.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: She can give you some personal experience.

REP. REBIMBAS: And I'll look -- and I'll look forward to hearing from her because certainly if that's -- if that's a break in our system, which certainly I could tell you right now, from one courthouse to the other, you do get, you know, big discrepancies. But maybe there's another way of also addressing it so I'll look forward to that testimony and thank you taking the time to testify.

MICHELLE NOEHREN: You're welcome and I'll -

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you, Madam -

MICHELLE NOEHREN: -- put together some statistics for you and Representative Wood.

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. URBAN: Thank you. Are there any other questions? Seeing none -- yes? Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Also as a former breast feeder, I'm -- I'm up here actually, working up here. But I was thinking that the problem with the court is that they're more formal. You know, in some work places the workers -- the co-workers and the bosses are quite sympathetic with the need to express milk and they work with you.

The court is so structured it may be more difficult for the mother to express milk at the time when she needs to without disrupting the courtroom proceedings. So I'm thinking that's what the problem might be. But we can continue

to work this out. And maybe just instruction to the judicial system might make the problem go away without legislation. But we don't know that yet until we've talked to the judicial system.

REP. URBAN: Are there any other questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

Next on our list is Deputy Commissioner Janice Gruendel and are you and Anne going to testify together or separately?

A VOICE: (Inaudible.)

REP. URBAN: Go, Anne.

A VOICE: She has a great (inaudible.)

REP. URBAN: Welcome.

JANICE GRUENDEL: Good afternoon, Senator Gerratana, Representative Urban and members of the Select Committee on Children. My name's Janice Gruendel and I have the privilege of being here with you before so thank you for the chance to come back.

I'm the deputy commissioner for operations in the Department of Children and Families, and I'm here to offer support for H -- for H -- bill -- H bill -- H.B. Number 5219, AN ACT CONCERNING THE INCLUSION OF YOUNG ADULTS IN the ANNUAL REPORT CARD ON POLICIES AND PROGRAMS AFFECTING CHILDREN.

I'm joined today by Anne McIntyre-Lahner, whom you also know very well, who's a program director with the department and she's overseeing our results based accountability efforts and serving with you on the steering

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**SELECT  
COMMITTEE  
ON  
CHILDREN  
PART 2  
319 - 596**

**2012**

REP. URBAN: Thank you so much for your testimony and I think it's great that you have such a strong moral compass. And it really means a lot as we have said before when students who have gone through this come up here and testify and tell us what they went through. I'm -- I'm sorry for what you had to deal with, but I admire your fortitude.

ALLISON PETIT: Thank you. It definitely made me who I am today. Definitely showed me what my passion was.

REP. URBAN: Well, see, there -- there's always a silver lining someplace, I hope. Are there any questions or comments for -- okay. Thank you so much and thank you so much for waiting. I really, really appreciate it, Allison.

Michelle Griswold. Is Michele still -- ah, she's managed to stay the course. Welcome, Michele.

MICHELE GRISWOLD: Good afternoon, Representative Urban and members of the committee. My name's Michele Griswold and I'm a pediatric and maternal child nurse as well as an internationally board certified lactation consultant. And I'm here today on behalf of the Connecticut Breast Feeding Coalition in favor -- to testify in favor of Bill 194.

In Connecticut, mothers have the legal right to breast feed wherever they are allowed to be except apparently in the court room. The obligation of jury duty has been identified as a barrier for nursing mothers in Connecticut. Although postponement is possible, the maximum amount of time to postpone falls short of the minimum recommendations for breast feeding duration.

The issue is that breast feeding mothers have a unique physiologic need to either nurse or to express milk at frequent intervals during the day in order to continue to make enough milk for their children. Even if a breast feeding mother is able to successfully navigate the day or so of the selection process, she may be chosen to serve, and as we know some cases last days, weeks or even months.

Connecticut courts do not consistently accommodate breast feeding mothers by providing safe, clean reliable places to express milk. Nor do they allow children in court. A forced separation of the breast feeding mother and child predisposes the mother to infection, compromised ability to produce milk, early breast feeding discontinuation and ultimately, increased health risks for herself and for her child.

Just three days ago the American Academy of Pediatrics issued an updated policy on breast feeding in which they state, "Breast feeding should not be considered a lifestyle choice but rather a basic health issue." To that end the AAP recommends breast feeding continuation for up to one year for children and beyond as desired by mother and child. Less than three in ten children in Connecticut receive the minimum amount of breast feeding, and as such are at increased risk for obesity, asthma, diabetes, allergies and SIDS, among other conditions.

Stopping breast feeding before the recommended time puts the mothers at risk for breast and ovarian cancer. Despite the myriad of barriers -- I just have one more -

REP. URBAN: Finish, please go ahead and finish.

MICHELE GRISWOLD: Okay. Despite the myriad of barriers most Connecticut mothers are choosing to breast feed. In 2009, of the almost 40,000 infants born in the state, 30,000 of their mothers chose to initiate breast feeding based on the promise for optimal opportunities for health.

Unfortunately, most stopped before the recommended times and Connecticut's breast feeding rates underachieved national objectives.

The fact is that the health of Connecticut's mothers and children is threatened by the lack of opportunity for successful breast feeding due in part to societal barriers. Breast feeding mothers should be able to maintain their right to participate in the judicial process and breast feed their children for at least the minimum recommended duration.

We ask you to support Bill 194 for up to one year in order to remove just one of the barriers that breast feeding mothers face. Thank you for your time.

REP. URBAN: Thank you for your testimony and thank you for waiting as long as you did. Would you repeat that that's the latest information is (sic) because there were questions from the committee as to whether one year was an excessive amount of time and they -- the current recommendation is the one year.

MICHELE GRISWOLD: The current recommendation is one year. The AAP recommends six months exclusive breast feeding, which means the child receives nothing but mother's milk for six months. And

the child -- the recommendation for the child is then continued breast feeding with complimentary foods up to one year minimum. The World Health Organization actually recommends two years minimum.

REP. URBAN: Yeah, that doesn't surprise me but -- I think that there's a lot of support for this on the committee and I really appreciate your testimony. Are there questions?  
Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you for your testimony. Because of your profession and the involvement you have, could -- do you have any specific examples of women who have been maybe not treated properly if they were called for jury duty in this regard and the postponement process?

MICHELE GRISWOLD: I do and it was in -- I have two examples. One example is that I get lots and lots of email from breast feeding mothers. I rarely get an email from a breast feeding mother who's had a wonderful jury duty experience.

The other example that I have is an article from the New Haven Register. In October or November of last year where a breast feeding mother in New Haven did report for jury duty she had already postponed. And she reported for jury duty and asked if there was a place where she could express her milk and was shown to a room -- sort of a closet with piles of chairs. And I don't know if anyone saw that article. Wires sticking out of the walls because of the length of the cord she had to sit on the floor near the wires. So that's one example, as well.

We also have -- we have a mom here who's going to testify, too, with her own experience.

REP. REBIMBAS: That's too bad. That's shameful because court houses are equipped with rooms, conference rooms. For God's sakes, judges' chambers, if you need to, in order to secure someone's privacy and a safe environment. So that's awful to hear.

I actually am just going to make a recommendation out to you and your organization and the people that you come in contact with. I don't know what's going to happen with this bill, but certainly it still has a long way to go.

And if this is an issue that it could be maybe court specific or not -- did you bring this to the commissioner's attention in the judicial branch? Have you reached out to the commissioner?

MICHELE GRISWOLD: No.

REP. REBIMBAS: Okay. My first recommendation is you have to reach out to the commissioner of the judicial branch. Because she may not even know that this is going on. And unless it makes it up to the administrative level, each court house, unfortunately, and I said it earlier, almost has their own practices and sometimes may be needlessly, mindlessly they do these irresponsible acts.

And, of course, you don't want a mother having to advocate for herself because she's already mortified about what she has to do in a clothes closet and that person didn't have the decency to inspect the closet and see how the person would feel that's being placed there.

Please reach out and let that appropriate person know because it's their responsibility to address these things.

I'd go further to say as it seems like many people support this issue to send out a letter then to that person and you might want to contact us individually, your state reps, your Senators.

Because I don't know where this bill's going to end. But we shouldn't wait either to see if we can actually make something and make the appropriate people aware of it in order to properly address it. And it may be through legislation because if that person on the higher up says, "Well, there's nothing we can do. It's not in law. We're just following the law" then we'll change the law, no question about it. Otherwise if it's an educational component, if it's an awareness component, it needs to be addressed sooner than later. So thank you.

REP. URBAN: Are there any other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your testimony, Michele. And next is Rachel Jackson and thank you, Rachel, too, for waiting.

RACHEL JACKSON: Hi. Good afternoon, members of the committee and thank you for this opportunity to present my testimony. As a current breast feeding mother I'm here in favor of AN ACT CONCERNING POSTPONEMENT OF JURY DUTY FOR BREAST FEEDING MOTHERS.

SB194

I was initially issued a summons for jury duty for a date that was shortly after the date that I was due with my second son. When I called the jury administration to postpone my

appearance day I inquired about accommodations for breast feeding mothers.

Specifically, I asked if there would be an area in which I would be able to express milk for my son and if I would be able to do so three times during the day. The woman who I spoke to said that each court was different, but that I could always go pump in my car and that she was sure it would be fine to do that three times during the day.

I was surprised by this answer and decided to follow up with the court directly but would wait closer until my rescheduled appearance date in March. I recently called to follow up with the Rockville Superior Court where I would be serving. I was told that there wasn't a dedicated space where I could express milk, but that there would probably be a room available. And if not I would be escorted around the building until one could be found. When I asked if I would be able to have three breaks in order to pump, she said that I could go whenever I needed to, that is, unless I was in the courtroom or called to serve on the jury. And then I wouldn't be able to leave the court room except for the lunch break that everyone receives.

Speaking to her made me considerably more concerned about my upcoming appearance date and I began to feel an increasing amount of stress about my juror's service. I worried that they would not be able to find a place for me to pump, that I would not be able to pump when I needed to, that because of the uncertainty and stress I would not be able to pump the amount of milk I needed to send for my son. And that if I don't pump enough during the day I would

end up with mastitis, which are painfully infected milk ducts.

This is for one day of jury duty. I can't begin to imagine what would happen if I actually was called for a trial that lasted several days. If I had to sit in a courtroom for multiple days I'd be preoccupied with the fact that my milk supply was being compromised by my inability to express milk for my child who depends on me to provide for him. And not just compromised for the time that I would serve but that it could potentially end my ability to breast feed my child.

This may sound like an unlikely outcome, but as a working mother who's expressing milk daily for her child while she's apart from him, it's a very real threat. Even under the best conditions, milk expression can be challenging and difficult to maintain. But despite the challenges I do so because that's what's best for my son's health and my own health.

Please remove this additional hurdle for breast feeding mothers and support AN ACT CONCERNING POSTPONEMENT OF JURY DUTY FOR BREAST FEEDING MOTHERS.

The passage of this act might not come in time for me to take advantage of the postponement but I hope that my testimony can help other mothers not have to make the choice between the duty to their child and the duty to their state. I'm happy to fulfill my civic obligation and report for jury duty. I only ask that I be called to do so after I've fulfilled my responsibility to my child in providing him with the best nourishment possible. Thank you.

144

March 1, 2012

tmj/gbr SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN

2:30 P.M.

REP. URBAN: Thank you very much for waiting. Thank you for your testimony and perhaps, Representative Rebimbas can help out here.

REP. REBIMBAS: Madam Chair, I would be more than happy to. And thank you for sharing your story. And I think that's certainly a joint effort we can move forward on.

REP. URBAN: Thank you again. Are there any other questions or comments? We do really do appreciate you taking the time to be here for this testimony. It's enormously important.

RACHEL JACKSON: Thank you very much.

REP. URBAN: And your son's really lucky to have a mom like you.

RACHEL JACKSON: Thank you.

REP. URBAN: So you take care.

RACHEL JACKSON: All right.

REP. URBAN: Next is Melanie Hernandez. Is Melanie still here? She's gone. Okay. Gordon Nelson?

GORDON NELSON: Certainly, first, thanks to you all for staying. Your work is indeed very important.

HBS218

My name is Gordon Nelson, I'm a university professor of chemistry at Florida Institute of Technology. My MS and PhD in chemistry are from Yale. I was the first manager of combustibility technology at GE Plastics, Pittsfield, Mass. I was the vice president of material science and technology at Springborn Labs in Connecticut, in Enfield. For 20 years

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
JUDICIAL BRANCHEXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION231 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, Connecticut 06106  
(860) 757-2270 Fax (860) 757-2215Testimony of Stephen N. Ment  
Select Committee on Children Public Hearing  
March 1, 2012Senate Bill 194, An Act Concerning the Postponement of  
Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony on behalf of the Judicial Branch in opposition to Senate Bill 194, An Act Concerning the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers.

The Judicial Branch respectfully suggests that this bill is unnecessary. Under existing law, any person who receives a notice to appear for jury service can postpone their date to a time that is more convenient for them, within ten months of the original date. The bill would increase this by two months exclusively for breastfeeding mothers. From an operational standpoint, Jury Administration does not have a mechanism to know for certain who is a breastfeeding mother. From an equity standpoint, this proposal would open up the door for other classes of individuals to seek a similar benefit.

The Judicial Branch is cognizant of the unique needs created when a breastfeeding mother is summoned for jury service and has taken measures to accommodate those needs. Many courthouses have rooms set aside for nursing mothers. In instances where there is not a room specifically designated, court staff work to provide the individual with an appropriate accommodation. We appreciate the sacrifice that jury service entails, and welcome phone calls prior to one's date of service informing us of any special needs.

Finally, in addition to the ability to postpone, any individual summoned may seek to be exempted from jury service if serving will present an extreme hardship for them.

In conclusion, we respectfully request that the Committee take no action on this bill.



CONNECTICUT  
Breastfeeding Coalition

**TESTIMONY TO THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY SELECT  
COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN IN FAVOR OF SB 194 (Raised) An Act  
Concerning the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding  
Mothers**

March 1, 2012

Michele Griswold, MPH, RN, IBCLC  
Chair

Connecticut Breastfeeding Coalition

Good Afternoon Senator Gerratana, Representative Urban and members of the committee, I thank you for the opportunity to present the following testimony on behalf of the Connecticut Breastfeeding Coalition in favor of AN ACT CONCERNING THE POSTPONEMENT OF JURY DUTY FOR BREASTFEEDING MOTHERS. In Connecticut, mothers have the legal right to breastfeed wherever they are allowed to be except apparently in the courtroom. The obligation of jury duty has been identified as a barrier for nursing mothers in Connecticut. Although postponement is possible, the maximum amount of time to postpone, falls short of the minimum recommendations for breastfeeding. The issue is that breastfeeding mothers have a unique physiologic need to either nurse or to express milk at frequent intervals during the day in order to continue to make enough milk for their children. Even if a breastfeeding mother is able to successfully navigate the day or so of the selection process, she may be chosen to serve. Some cases last days, weeks or even months. Connecticut courts do not consistently accommodate breastfeeding mothers by providing safe, clean, reliable places to express milk, nor do they allow children in court. A forced separation of the breastfeeding mother and child predisposes the mother to infection, compromised ability to produce milk, early breastfeeding discontinuation and ultimately increased health risks for her child and herself.

Just three days ago, The American Academy of Pediatrics, issued an updated policy on Breastfeeding in which they state "Breastfeeding should not be considered a lifestyle choice, but rather as a basic health issue." To that end, the AAP recommends about 6 months exclusive breastfeeding and continuation for up to one year for children. Only 2 in 10 Connecticut children receive the minimum amount of breastfeeding and as such are at increased risk for obesity, asthma, diabetes, allergies and SIDS among other conditions. Stopping breastfeeding

before the recommended time, puts their mothers at risk for breast and ovarian cancer and possibly post partum depression.

Despite the myriad of barriers, most Connecticut mothers are choosing to breastfeed. In 2009, of the almost 40,000 infants born in the state, 30,000 of their mothers chose to initiate breastfeeding based on the promise for optimal opportunities for health. Unfortunately, most stop before the recommended time contributing to breastfeeding rates in Connecticut that underachieve the national objectives. The fact is that the health of Connecticut's mothers and children is threatened by the lack of opportunity for successful breastfeeding due in part to societal barriers. Breastfeeding mothers should be able to maintain their right to participate in the judicial process and breastfeed their children for at the least the minimum recommended duration.

We ask that you support AN ACT CONCERNING THE POSTPONEMENT OF JURY DUTY FOR BREASTFEEDING MOTHERS for up to one year in order to remove just one of the barriers that breastfeeding mothers face. I am sure that we can all agree that Connecticut's children deserve the best start in life. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele Griswold, MPH, RN, IBCLC

Chair

Connecticut Breastfeeding Coalition

[www.breastfeedingct.org](http://www.breastfeedingct.org)

[mgriswold@breastfeedingct.org](mailto:mgriswold@breastfeedingct.org)

860.510.2599

Testimony to the Connecticut General Assembly Select Committee on Children in Favor of  
SB 194 AN ACT CONCERNING THE POSTPONEMENT OF JURY DUTY FOR BREASTFEEDING  
MOTHERS

March 1, 2012

Submitted by: Rachel L. Jackson

Good afternoon members of the committee, and thank you for this opportunity to present my testimony. As a current breastfeeding mother I am in favor of An Act Concerning the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers. I first received a jury duty summons with a date in the end of July 2011. Since I was pregnant at the time and due in the beginning of July, I called to postpone my date until March 2012. I was surprise upon inspecting the summons that the longest amount of time that I could extend my appearance date would be 10 months. While there is a physical disability disqualification, I do not feel as though pregnancy or breastfeeding qualify as a physical disability and so I did not pursue that disqualification.

When I called the Jury Administration to postpone my appearance date, I inquired about accommodations for breastfeeding mothers. Specifically, I asked if there would be an area in which I would be able to express milk for my son and if I would be able to do so 3 times during the day. The woman who I spoke to said that each court was different but that I could always go and pump in my car and that she was sure it would be fine to do that 3 times during the day. I was quite surprise by this answer, decided to follow up with the court directly, but would wait until closer to my rescheduled appearance date in March.

I recently called the Jury Administration to inquire again about accommodations for breastfeeding mothers. The woman I spoke to this time was considerably more sympathetic but still could not provide me with any more reassuring information. She recommended calling the court that I would be serving at directly since accommodations varied widely. I called the Rockville Superior Court, where I would be serving, and was told that there wasn't a dedicated space where I could express milk, but that there would probably be a room available and if not I would be escorted around the building until one could be found. When I asked if I would be able to have 3 breaks in order to pump, she said that I could go when ever I needed to. That is, unless, I was in the court room or called to serve on a jury, and then I wouldn't be able to leave the court room except for the lunch break that everyone receives.

Speaking to her made considerably more concerned about my upcoming appearance date and I began to feel an increasing amount of stress about my juror service. I worry that they will not be able to find a place for me to pump, that I will not be able to pump when I need to, that because of the uncertainty and stress I will not be able to pump the amount of milk that I need

to send for my son and that if I don't pump enough times during the day that I will end up with mastitis, which are painfully, infected milk ducts.

This is for one day of jury duty, I can't begin to imagine what would happen if I actually was called for a trial that lasted several days. If I had to sit in a court room for multiple days, I would be preoccupied with the fact that my milk supply was being compromised by my inability to express milk for my child who depends on me to provide for him. And not just compromised for the time that I would serve, but that it could potentially end my ability to breastfeed my child. This may sound like an unlikely outcome, but as a working mother who is expressing milk daily for her child while she is apart from him, it is a very real threat. Even under the best conditions milk expression can be challenging and difficult to maintain. Despite the challenges, I do it because it what is best for my son's health and my own health.

Please remove this additional hurdle for breastfeeding mothers and support An Act Concerning the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers.

The passage of this act may not come in time for me to take advantage of the postponement, but I hope that my testimony can help other mothers not have to make the choice between duty to their child and their state.

I am happy to fulfill my civic obligation and report for jury duty.

I only ask that I be called to do so after I have fulfilled my responsibility to my child, in providing him with best nourishment possible.

Respectfully Submitted

Rachel L Jackson

[Racheljackson80@gmail.com](mailto:Racheljackson80@gmail.com)

Testimony of  
Christa Allard  
Before the  
Select Committee on Children  
March 1, 2012

In Support of S.B. 194, AAC the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers

My name is Christa Allard, and I'm mom to sweet, silly Nora. I have nursed Nora for all 10 months of her life, something I'm proud of and very fortunate to be able to provide for my daughter.

In those early weeks, breastfeeding your newborn is a nursing mother's sole priority. I spent the majority of Nora's first days camped out on my couch with her in my lap, nursing every two hours - sometimes every hour - establishing the milk supply that continues to sustain her to this day. It's imperative that new moms put this hard work in at the beginning, because it is what sets the groundwork for the duration of a breastfeeding relationship, whether that lasts two days or two years.

Even now after 10 months, it's difficult for me to be away from my daughter for more than a couple hours at a time. Though I was fortunate enough to have been gifted a double electric breast pump - a luxury not all moms can afford - and can on occasion leave expressed milk for someone else to feed Nora in my absence, more often than not Nora needs me there, and I tend to stay nearby. Breastfeeding provides more than nutrition for babies. For Nora, nursing provides a comfort that nothing else can; a refuge when she's overstimulated, a snuggle when she's sick or in pain, and love from a willing mother. She needs me more often than just at mealtime and there's simply no substitution for mom to a nursed baby.

Being away from Nora for hours on end, let alone for days as jury duty may require, would jeopardize our breastfeeding relationship. Without the option to nurse my daughter or otherwise express breast milk, my supply would decrease and I would no longer make enough milk to keep up with Nora's demand. It should be up to the mother and child as to when they are mutually ready to transition away from breastfeeding; they shouldn't be forced into it because they are also performing a civic duty.

I've figured out how to do a lot of things while nursing Nora (including writing this testimony) but serving on a jury isn't one of them. Please consider supporting SB 194 and breastfeeding moms in the state.

Thank you,

Christa Allard  
Wethersfield, CT

American  
Academy of  
Pediatrics

HEZEKIAH BEARDSLEY  
CONNECTICUT CHAPTER

HEZEKIAH BEARDSLEY CONNECTICUT CHAPTER

104 HUNGERFORD STREET • HARTFORD, CT 06106 • TEL. (860) 525-9738 • FAX (860) 727-9863

**TESTIMONY TO THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN IN FAVOR OF SB 194 (Raised) An Act Concerning the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers**

Submitted by: Kathleen A Marinelli, MD, IBCLC, FABM, FAAP,  
Neonatologist and Lactation Services, Connecticut Children's Medical Center, Hartford, CT;  
Connecticut Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics Executive Committee Member;  
American Academy of Pediatrics Connecticut Chapter Breastfeeding Coordinator

Date: March 1, 2012

As a Neonatologist at Connecticut Children's Medical Center, I have cared for many newborns and their mothers over the past 23 years in CT. As the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) states in its most recent Policy Statement on Breastfeeding and the Use of Human Milk (Pediatrics February 27, 2012), "The AAP reaffirms its recommendation of exclusive breastfeeding for about 6 months, followed by continued breastfeeding as complementary foods are introduced, with continuation of breastfeeding for 1 year or longer as mutually desired by mother and infant." With an average of 75% of mothers initiating breastfeeding in the hospital, we know mothers and families understand the importance of human milk to their babies and to themselves. As also stated in the AAP Policy Statement, breastfeeding and the support of breastfeeding is more than a lifestyle choice—it is a public health issue and needs to be recognized as such.

This brings us to the issue of jury duty for breastfeeding mothers. In 2000, we successfully introduced, and the legislature voted into law, Public Act No. 01-182 AN ACT CONCERNING BREASTFEEDING IN THE WORKPLACE. This law protects a mother's right to express her milk or nurse her baby in the workplace. This is necessary because while she is away from the baby at work, 1) the baby need to eat and 2) if the mother does not empty her breast, she will become engorged which is painful, will affect her ability to work, will lead to decreased milk for her baby as breastfeeding works on supply and demand; and may lead to serious medical complications such as plugged ducts and mastitis.

The issue with jury duty is that although breastfeeding mothers can be issued an exemption, at best it is for the first 10 months of a baby's life. A mother following her pediatrician's advice to breastfeed for at least one year is still breastfeeding at that time. If called for jury duty, she will be separated from her baby for a minimum of one day if not called for a case, for up to many days, weeks or months depending on the case she is chosen for. This is not supportive of the public health mandate to support her to breastfeed. Not to mention that in this unsupported state, she will not be giving her full attention to the case at hand, and will likely find serving on a jury as extremely difficult, and possibly not be able to do the best job possible. No accommodation is made for her to bring the baby with her, or for her to have a place and the time (2-3 times during an 8 hour work day) to express her milk in a safe, private clean environment that is not a bathroom (as our workplace law states). It is therefore impossible for her to provide for her baby and serve on a jury simultaneously.

SB 194 (Raised) An Act Concerning the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers would exempt breastfeeding mothers from jury duty for the first 12 months of her baby's life, in keeping with AAP recommendations.

Therefore, I ask the Committee on Children to please act favorably in passing this bill forward. SB 194 has the full support of the Connecticut Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics.

COMMISSION OFFICERS  
 Antonia "Toni" Moran, *Chair*  
 Melanie O'Brien, *Vice Chair*  
 Mary Lee A. Kiegan, *Secretary*  
 Denise Rodosevich, *Treasurer*

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
 Teresa C. Younger



COMMISSIONERS  
 Lucia A. Aschettino  
 JoAnn Calnen  
 Mayor April Capone  
 Yvonne R. Davis  
 Barbara DeBaptiste  
 Adrienne Farrar Houel  
 Kristin A. LaFleur  
 Jean L. Rexford  
 Helene Shay  
 Patricia E.M. Whitcombe  
 Cecilia J. Woods

HONORARY MEMBERS  
 Connie Dice  
 Patricia T. Hendel  
 Patricia Russo

Testimony of  
 Michelle Noehren  
 Events & Special Projects Manager  
 The Permanent Commission on the Status of Women  
 Before the  
 Select Committee on Children  
 March 1, 2012

Re: H.B. 5218, AAC Toxic Fire Retardants in Children's Products  
S.B. 194, AAC the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers

Senators Gerratana and Suzio, Representatives Urban and Wood, and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony in support of H.B. 5218, AAC Toxic Fire Retardants in Children's Products and S.B. 194, AAC the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers.

PCSW does not come before this committee very frequently because our purview is women over the age of 18 but the two bills we are here in support of today have a great impact on mothers.

H.B. 5218, AAC Toxic Fire Retardants in Children's Products would ban the use of toxic chemicals, particularly toxis tris, in products geared towards children under the age of three. According to a report entitled *Hidden Hazards in the Nursery*, many of the products mothers use with their babies contain this toxic tris. These products include breastfeeding support pillows, car seats and diaper changing pads. Toxic tris has been shown to be a carcinogen, a hormone disruptor, and to have an impact on the nervous system.

While there are clear reasons to ban this chemical for the health of our children, we are also here because mothers deserve the ability to purchase products for their children that are safe. Most mothers have no idea that toxic chemicals are being used in common baby products. For example, many mothers choose to breastfeed their children to enhance their baby's immune systems but at the same time they may also be unknowingly exposing their child to toxic chemicals by using breastfeeding support pillows.

We applaud the committee's attention to the use of toxic chemicals in children's products because parents should be able to be confident that the products they buy and give their children are safe.

PCSW also supports S.B. 194, AAC the Postponement of Jury Duty for Breastfeeding Mothers. Jury duty is an important civic responsibility that all citizens should be ready to participate in, however for mothers that are breastfeeding and/or expressing milk by pumping, jury duty can present a challenge.

PCSW Testimony  
Before the Select Committee on Children  
March 1, 2012  
Page 2 of 2

For very new mothers, many lactation consultants suggest not switching back and forth between breast and bottle until a good rhythm of breastfeeding has been established in order to avoid confusion. This means that many mothers do not have the option of pumping and must be physically present to feed their baby, which is a challenge if serving on jury duty.

Additionally, for women that are used to breastfeeding and/or expressing milk in certain intervals throughout the day, sitting in a courtroom for hours can literally cause physical pain as breasts become engorged. New babies breastfeed 8-10 times a day while older babies breastfeed anywhere from 6-8 times per day. Breastfeeding requires a series commitment and interruptions in her schedule can have a big impact on the mother.

S.B. 194 would ease these challenges and concerns by allowing the jury administrator more flexibility in granting a postponement of jury duty to breastfeeding mothers (up to 12 months). According to the National Conference of State Legislatures twelve other states currently exempt breastfeeding mothers from jury duty including California, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Oregon and Virginia.<sup>1</sup>

Thank you for your attention to these matters and for the opportunity to provide testimony on behalf of women in Connecticut.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Council of State Legislatures, *Breastfeeding Laws*, May 2011 <<http://www.ncsl.org/issues-research/health/breastfeeding-state-laws.aspx>>

**H – 1141**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2012**

**VOL.55  
PART 19  
6188 – 6484**

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

510  
May 4, 2012

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Seeing they have, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5317, as amended by House "A".

Total number voting	141
Necessary for adoption	71
Those voting Yea	137
Those voting Nay	4
Those absent and not voting	10

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Bill as amended is passed.

Mr. Clerk, kindly call 474.

THE CLERK:

On Page 32, Calendar 474, Senate Bill Number 194,  
AN ACT CONCERNING THE POSTPONEMENT OF JURY DUTY FOR  
BREASTFEEDING MOTHERS. Favorable report on the  
Committee in Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The distinguished Chair of the Children's  
Committee, Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

511  
May 4, 2012

the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Good evening, ma'am. And, the question is on acceptance and passage. Will you explain the Bill, please madam?

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill about accommodating nursing moms who are doing their jury duty. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has in his possession an amendment, LCO Number 4073. I ask that he call it and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 4073, previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Will the Clerk please call the amendment?

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 4073, Senate "A", offered by Senator Gerratana, Representative Urban and Senator Suzio.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentleman has asked leave of the chamber to summarize. Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a strike all amendment and it still does focus on accommodating nursing moms and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on adoption. Remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule "A"?

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker this was brought to the kid's committee attention that some nursing moms were not receiving adequate accommodations when serving jury duty. We certainly do not want moms -- we certainly don't want to discourage moms from doing their civic responsibility in jury duty and we certainly don't want to discourage nursing moms from continuing to breastfeed their children. So, we worked with the jury administrator and we worked with the Connecticut Breastfeeding Coalition, Mr. Speaker, and we came up with language that we thought gave a comfort level to women that were considering jury duty while breastfeeding and made them feel that this was a basic health option. The language that we came up with, Mr. Speaker, has the judicial branch on their internal website,

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

513  
May 4, 2012

maintain a section with general information provided to breastfeeding women regarding their eligibility to postpone jury service. It contains contact information for the jury administrator in the case that a breastfeeding mom would like to request that reasonable accommodations be made and it also has the jury administrator provide training to his or her staff on discreet issues and policy for breastfeeding moms. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on adoption of Senate Amendment "A".

Will you remark further on Senate Amendment "A"?

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the proponent, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed, sir.

REP. SMITH (108th):

I'm just wondering if there had been any dialogue with the judicial department to make sure that they're on board with this change? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

514  
May 4, 2012

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, I did -- we actually worked with the jury administrator and the Connecticut Breastfeeding Coalition on the Bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Thank you. And, is there going to be any cost to the judicial department for the training that's set forth in this amendment? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there is no fiscal note.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

So, just so I'm clear, when there's no fiscal note, does that mean there's no fiscal cost? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

515  
May 4, 2012

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's correct.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Distinguished Ranking Member of the Children's Committee, Representative Wood.

REP. WOOD (141st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do stand in support of this Bill. It basically does three things as the Chairman just mentioned. It's going to provide information on the website for breastfeeding mothers who were contemplating jury duty or who have been called for jury duty; number two, it's going to be training to the court staff on policy and information on breastfeeding while they're on jury duty; and, three, it will allow postponement for 10 months. Truthfully, I wish we didn't have to do this Bill. I wish the courts had just taken it upon themselves to implement this policy and not something we had to put into statute, but we do. So, I would encourage everyone to vote on this. Thank you very much.

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

516  
May 4, 2012

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, madam.

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening, Mr. Speaker. I too rise in strong support of this amendment and through you, Mr. Speaker, a few questions to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed, sir.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Line seven in the amendment talks about the ability to postpone jury service and I know it is for a 10 month period and after that, how does the mother get back on the list to serve jury duty again? Is that an automatic or is that a process that she will have to go through?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, just like any prospective juror who had postponed their service for 10 months, it would automatically be put back on the

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

517  
May 4, 2012

list. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Srivivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, through you, Mr. Speaker, one more question to the proponent. Reasonable in line 14, we talk about reasonable accommodations that can be made. Could you maybe, through you, Mr. Speaker, elaborate or give us some examples of what those reasonable accommodations would be like? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are really going to leave that up to the jury administrator. We have discussed it; they are in contact with the Connecticut Breastfeeding Coalition and because different court houses have different accommodations, we didn't want to be specific about, you know, exactly what it would look like, so we're leaving that to the Connecticut Breastfeeding Coalition and the jury administrator so that we'll be able to come up with something with each and every court house. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

518  
May 4, 2012

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the answers from the proponent. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening and --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Good evening.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

-- may I ask a few questions to the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

You may.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My first question is when a jury service notice goes out -- as I read this the person is able to postpone and when a jury notice for jury duty goes out, there is enumerated check the box reasons to be able to postpone your jury duty. Would this Bill require the judicial department to add this excuse as a reason to postpone jury duty?

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

519  
May 4, 2012

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that it's your right to postpone jury duty for the first time for a 10 month period, so this would not be added to any list. But, as we have expressed, it would be on the website to help a nursing mom if she needed more information or if she was considering jury duty but was afraid about accommodations. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, in the public hearing testimony, was there any discussion about issues of even pregnant woman serving jury duty? Did that issue come up at all? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, we actually did have one mom come in and talk about getting her notice for

jury duty when she was pregnant and she was very supportive of having this kind of information up on the website. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the answers to my questions. I do stand in support of this Bill and I think just to add to the discussion, I had the experience of my wife being called on jury duty in her late months of pregnancy and she ended up having a high risk pregnancy and didn't delay because obviously the way the timing was, did not realize that this was going to be an issue. And, surprisingly going before a female judge, she was actually not let out of her obligation and was selected to serve on the jury and struggled going to the trial -- they had postponed it and each day she'd have to go to her doctor's appointment and then go and serve on the panel. We were fortunate, my son was born within a week later and ended up in intensive care for a number of weeks and to this day it's been an issue. It was sort of shocking that a female judge would have done that and so, I think going forward you might even want to take

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

521  
May 4, 2012

a look at that issue as well because there's no reasons for these things to happen and it is unfortunate we need to legislate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of questions for the proponent, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed, sir.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Here it says that some kind of training is going to be provided. Could you elaborate as to what type of training is going to be involved and you had said earlier on that there was not going to be any cost associated with it. I think I'll just ask two questions in the same. One is, the type of training and why would there be no cost associated with it; and, then the second is, when you have to make separate or special accommodations for a woman for breastfeeding, would that entail having a separate room for example, with a bathroom or any kind of

special accommodations that a normal jury room would not have? And, if so, would they be required to provide that? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, we have left it up to the jury administrator to come up with type of training that they would like to use for this, presuming that there's going to be a lot of web based and the Connecticut Coalition for Breastfeeding would be very helpful in that regard. So, we didn't actually mandate a specific training or awareness procedure. As far as the accommodations, again, I think that we have moved way forward on accommodating breastfeeding moms and moms who want to express their milk and we have statute concerning those kinds of issues. You can see it right here in the LOB where we have accommodations and what has been done, is it's been fit in with the regular area. They've just separated out a place for a breastfeeding mom. So, our assumption would be depending upon the layout of specific courts. Different court houses are laid out differently. So, we would leave it to them to come up

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

523  
May 4, 2012

with the appropriate way to have a private area for a mom who was breastfeeding. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78th):

I thank you for that answer and I'm certainly supportive of the intent of the Bill. The only concern I have is it reads to me like it's some type of a mandate where the jury administrative shall provide training. I would read that to mean that that would apply anywhere in the state and even though we do not know what type of training is at this moment, I would assume that that's a mandate. It's not may provide training, it's shall provide training and that strikes me as it would infer that there are going to be costs associated with doing this program and that's the reason why I was asking the question when you had met with the jury administrator as to what type of training would be provided and since it was going to be state-wide, what the cost would be related to that. Through you, Mr. Speaker, am I misreading that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the good gentleman that we worked very hard with the jury administrator on this language to get it right and we are basically talking about reasonable accommodations that may be made. That's going to be a big part of the training. And, I think the other part of the training would simply be having a reasonable approach to a mom who might need to step out to pump milk. I don't think this is sort of rocket science training. So, I don't think that we're going to look at a cost and I know that the jury administrator certainly would have told us and the Office of Fiscal Analysis if they thought there would in any going to be a cost. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Thank you very much for that answer and thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (15th):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker. I want to rise in

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

525  
May 4, 2012

support of the Bill that's here before us and I do believe that it's actually a better Bill than what appeared before the select Committee on Children. And, I say that because we certainly all voted in favor of it for the committee because we wanted to see it proceed but we really wanted to make sure that there was open communication with the judicial branch. Because, what we heard during testimony was a very disturbing story of a woman who was breastfeeding and unfortunately was offered what she described, a small room that looked like a closet with exposed wires. And, when I actually proceeded to then inquire whether or not she filed a complaint regarding it or had inquired, you know, after her experience with anyone as to if there was any other options or just to simply complain about her experience because it was certainly devastating enough to her, that it led to her to come up here and testify before us, she hadn't. And, I think that's where sometimes we're quick knee jerk reaction to propose legislation where sometimes it could have been resolved by simply letting the judicial branch know, letting the administrative jury -- jury administrator know about the experience. But, nonetheless as a result, we did move the Bill forward

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

526  
May 4, 2012

knowing that there was going to be that open line of communication and there was going to be something proposed that was going to be reasonable for everyone. I certainly do agree that the Bill before us is a reasonable one. Because what it does, is it identifies the issue that is out there and it's going to provide the information necessary then for any woman whose breastfeeding to go onto the website and get the information again for the accommodations. So, I do think it's a good one. And, although we do have the option to postpone under normal circumstances, we have to take -- we have to consider, well, someone may opt to postpone when they're pregnant and you're only allowed to postpone once without getting a nasty letter that you might actually be arrested because you're not serving your duty to the State of Connecticut. But, yet at the same time, so later one when you actually have delivered the child and you want to breastfeed, you need other options. And, then there simply might be some people that don't want to postpone, want to do their civic duty and want to have the opportunity to serve. So, I do believe that the Bill before us is certainly a good one. I'm happy to see that there is not a fiscal note attached to it

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

527  
May 4, 2012

because hopefully this is simply informational for the staff at the court house to be sensitive to these issues, be aware of where these rooms and accommodations are necessary. So, I do rise in support of it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, ma'am.

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, good evening to you. I have a couple of questions it I may for the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

This is certainly an initiative that I support but I would like some clarification particularly since we have the strike all amendment. And, I did just want to be sure because the language is not actually explicit on this point; I want to be sure that the language as it is written in the amendment, does in fact allow the postponement for breastfeeding women. That sounds like an obvious question, but the language is not actually explicit on that point, so for

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

528  
May 4, 2012

legislative intent, I just wonder if the good Representative could confirm that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, the 10 month postponement is your right, so a breastfeeding mom would have the same right as any other person for that 10 month postponement. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

Thank you. I think I heard that. It was a little bit difficult but I wonder -- could I -- would you mind if I ask the Representative to repeat it?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Could you repeat your answer, Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the 10 month postponement is a -- basically a right. So, a breastfeeding mom would have that same ability.

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

529  
May 4, 2012

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

Thank you. I appreciate that. I'm sorry it was a bit difficult there. And, another question I had, in line 9 of the amendment, there is a reference to other prospective jurors and I just wondered what an example of that sort of case might be? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is we just didn't want to leave out any possible questions that might come from any other juror so that we weren't being -- that we weren't discriminating against other jurors. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

Thank you very much, to the good Representative and I do stand in support of this Bill. I think it really is an excellent way to accommodate everyone and

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

530  
May 4, 2012

I don't see a down side. So, I stand in support of the Bill and urge everyone to support it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, ma'am.

Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule "A"? Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule "A"?

If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed Nay.

The Ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted and ruled technical.

Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?  
Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members to the chamber. The House is taking a roll call vote. Members to the chamber please.

smj/law/djp/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

531  
May 4, 2012

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Have all the members voted? If so, the machine will be locked, the Clerk will take a tally.

Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 194, as amended by Senate "A" in concurrence with the Senate.

Total number voting	140
---------------------	-----

Necessary for adoption	71
------------------------	----

Those voting Yea	140
------------------	-----

Those voting Nay	0
------------------	---

Those absent and not voting	11
-----------------------------	----

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Bill as amended is passed in concurrence with the Senate.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 478.

THE CLERK:

On Page 33, Calendar 478, substitute for Senate Bill Number 248, AN ACT CONCERNING PROBATE FEES.

Favorable report by the Committee on Finance.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative Jerry Fox.

REP. FOX (148th):

**S - 641**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2012**

**VOL. 55  
PART 6  
1633 - 1960**

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

21  
April 27, 2012

Thank you. Will you remark? Will you remark? If not, Senator Prague.

SENATOR PRAGUE:

Madam President, thank you. If there is no objection, I'd like to ask that this be placed on the Consent Calendar,

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, I guess, so ordered.

SENATOR PRAGUE:

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK;

On Page 11, Calendar 338, Senate Bill Number 194 AN ACT CONCERNING THE POSTPONEMENT OF JURY DUTY FOR BREAST-FEEDING MOTHERS. Favorable Report of the Committee on Judiciary.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

On acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Yes, Madam President. The Clerk has in his possession an amendment and it is LCO 4073. If he will call, and I be allowed to summarize.

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

22  
April 27, 2012

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 4073, Senate "A", offered by Senators  
Gerratana, Suzio and Representative Urban.

THE CHAIR:

Senator.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Madam President, I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark please?

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Thank you, Madam President. This is a strike-all amendment and it sets a protocol in place for breast-feeding women who are called for jury duty.

The amendment accomplishes clear communication for breast-feeding women as well as policy protocols for court personnel.

This was brought to the attention of the Select Committee on Children by a number of women who experienced inconsistencies in policy regarding breast-feeding protocols in our court system, and at this time I especially thank Attorney Steven Ment for working with the Committee and advocates to produce this language. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Senator Suzio. Oops. Ladies first, I gather. Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

23  
April 27, 2012

Thank you, Madam President. I rise to support this bill and amendment. I believe that by proposing this we highlight a very important issue of the importance, well the importance of breast feeding, something that I believe individuals didn't speak about very much in the past, but now we understand just how critical it is and how healthy it is for young children to be able to be provided this very important nourishment at the very beginning of their life and for the first 12 months.

It's also a very difficult time because there may be three-hour intervals throughout the day and into the night that a breast-feeding must occur.

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me, Senator. Could we keep the tone down a little bit. I'm having several hearing, I'm trying to hear Senator Boucher, so if we could keep the tone down, I really would appreciate it. Please proceed, ma'am.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Madam President. Again, highlighting the importance of this very important phase of child rearing and how often you can be interrupted as a mother every three hours, both during the course of the day and throughout the evening and I think the time period is a good one. It's a healthy one, and anything we can do to encourage and promote and accommodate this very important activity should be supported. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO:

Thank you, Madam President. And this time I rise without any ambivalence whatsoever to support the amendment. As Ranking Member of the Select Committee on Children, I, too, heard the same testimony that Senator Gerratana referred to and I happen to be

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

24  
April 27, 2012

married to a woman who, we had five children and she nursed all five of them.

THE CHAIR:

God bless her.

SENATOR SUZIO:

I totally appreciate the significant and the importance and the benefits of breast feeding for children, so I urge my colleagues to provide unanimous support for the proposed amendment. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Will you remark?  
Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Madam President. If I may, a couple of questions to the proponent of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana. Senator Witkos, please proceed, sir.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, is the focus of the bill to promote or allow an exemption from a postponement of jury service or is it to provide a discreet place to provide the breast feeding to the court. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Through you, Madam President. Yes in both cases, actually. Currently, under the protocol with the court system and I want to reassure the Senator that I

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

25  
April 27, 2012

had extensive conversations with the new jury administrator. She and I went through what is current practice.

There is provision for an extension of the ten months already, if you serve or are called to serve, rather. There is the ability for you to exempt yourself for ten months proposing at another date.

The jury administrator also has the ability to extend that another two months. Most people don't know that, that they do have that ability. So that's why I have this strike-all amendment because it gets to the heart of what the consistent, if you will, complaints that have come before our Committee are regarding this practice, and that is that there be sufficient accommodations for women who need to express milk if they do serve on a jury.

And that means that they now have the ability under this law, to have a discussion with the jury administrator and properly trained personnel to understand what the protocol would be in the accommodations in the court.

And also if, I believe there is under statute, if either the jury administrator or the court finds that it may be a hardship to postpone serving as a juror. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you. And through you, Madam President. While the conversations took place with the jury administrator, not spending too much time in a courtroom, if the judge is the controlling factor of the courtroom, have they weighed in on this, on the bill before us and if so, what was their comment? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

26  
April 27, 2012

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Through you, Madam President, if memory serves, I did not have a conversation, well, of course memory serves. I did not have a conversation with a judge, but I did do some research in the statutes. I believe that there is the ability for the judge to make a determination whether, and I think it's under a statute regarding hardship or other conditions. The judge has the ability to determine if someone meets the requirements and the protocols to serve as a juror. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you. I understand that would be for a possible exclusion from sitting on the jury. But as far as managing the courtroom during a daily activity, if a mother that breast feeds decides to and is selected to serve on a jury, has that been taken into consideration? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Through you, Madam President, as I understand it, the jury administrator can do the screening ahead of time if you will, by having that conversation and asking the breast-feeding woman if she would be able to serve.

So that is also something that we do under this bill and something I know in my discussion with the jury administrator that she can do also under her authority. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

27  
April 27, 2012

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Madam President. I thank Senator Gerratana for her answers.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark? All in favor of the, oh, all in favor of the amendment please say Aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The amendment carries. Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Thank you, Madam President. If there are no objections, I ask that this be placed on our Consent Calendar,.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, ma'am.

SENATOR GERRATANA;

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

At this point I'd ask for any points of personal privilege? Ah, Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for a point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

**S - 642**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2012**

**VOL. 55  
PART 7  
1961 - 2275**

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

107  
April 27, 2012

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark? Will you remark? All in favor, then I'll ask the Chamber, all in favor of Amendment "A", please say Aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Amendment "A" passes. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you. Thank you, Madam President. I would move that Senate Bill 368, Calendar 320 as amended be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Employees.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the Clerk would now call those items on the Consent Calendar, and if we might move to a vote on the First Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 26, Calendar 86, Senate Bill 150.

Page 11, Calendar 338, Senate Bill 194.

Page 12, Calendar 353, Senate Bill 366.

Page 27, Calendar 107, Senate Bill 218.

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

108  
April 27, 2012

On Page 29, Calendar 138, Senate Bill Number 27.

Page 26, Calendar 88, Senate Bill 55.

On Page 34, Calendar 311, Senate Bill 101.

On Page 9, Calendar 321, Senate Bill 414.

On Page 1, Calendar Number 63, Senate Bill 227.

On Page 5, Calendar 225, Senate Bill 410.

And on Page 11, Calendar 332, Senate Bill 341.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, Madam President, if we might wait just a moment.  
We needed to verify a couple of items before the  
Consent Calendar is voted.

THE CHAIR:

Absolutely, sir.

THE CLERK:

And there is one more item. On Page 33, Calendar 295,  
Senate Bill Number 248.

THE CHAIR:

Are any other additions or corrections that we can  
see? If not, then Mr. Clerk, will you please call for  
a roll call vote and the machine will be opened on the  
Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.  
Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll  
call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

pat/med/gbr  
SENATE

109  
April 27, 2012

Have all members voted? If all members voted the machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally on the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

On today's Consent Calendar.

Total number voting	35
Necessary for passage	18
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes.

Right now I ask for points of personal privilege.  
Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for a point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Madam President, on my way up to the Capitol this morning I learned the sad news of the passing of a good friend, Jo McKenzie, who many of us in the circle, especially those of us who belong to the Republican Party, affectionately knew Joe McKenzie as Momma Jo.

I first met Momma Jo in the early 1970s as a young boy. She was always active in the Republican Party. In 1979 she was the first woman ever elected Chairman of the Connecticut Republican Party and for probably 15 years plus, served as Republican National Committee Woman from the State of Connecticut.

She was a wonderful woman, always with a laugh and fun, had an incredible sense of style as you may know.