

RE: Proposed Bill 5180

February 24, 2009

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee concerning the proposed change to Bill 5180.

My experience with this Bill has been purely accidental after two of my daughters were denied necessary working papers for their employer: Butternut Ski Resort in Great Barrington, MA, where our family spends winter weekends. Ridgefield Public School refused to supply them with the papers because their employer was not in CT. We went to the website to research the CT Dept of Labor which does not mention a stipulation about CT-only employers. The girls missed work during the ensuing weekends until we got papers from MA. Although this proved to be frustrating, it has also been constructive. It became apparent that many other students were having the same unnecessary obstacles placed in the way of productive work.

It is almost impossible to discern if one is violating a law until you run into a problem because the contradictory regulations between 31-23, 5180 and the Dept of Labor. I am still left with the nagging concern about a law that includes language which only allows fourteen year olds to work at a golf course. That of course begs the question of, how many girl caddies are there and does that foreclose on fourteen year old female rights? Are we really saying that in CT our fourteen year students are only capable of working at golf courses? Why?

I appreciate and applaud the effort to simplify this issue and make it easier for our young people to use their time constructively.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Di Masters
100 South Salem Rd
Ridgefield, CT