



**Connecticut  
Public Health  
Association**

Promoting Public Health in Connecticut Since 1916

**CONNECTICUT PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION  
Testimony in opposition of  
SB 84 - AN ACT CONCERNING CADMIUM IN CHILDREN'S JEWELRY  
GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 18, 2014**

Dear Distinguished Members of the General Law Committee,

The Connecticut Public Health Association is strongly opposed to **Senate Bill 84 An Act Concerning Cadmium in Children's Jewelry** based on studies that show cadmium poses a significant health threat to children. It is our opinion that the passage of this legislation would put Connecticut children at considerable risk for health problems and illness and would be a significant step backward in our state's efforts to protect children's health.

In the past, the Connecticut Legislature has been very proactive in protecting children's health by phasing out lead, asbestos and even Bisphenol A (BPA) from items used by children. Four years ago, the Legislature recognized the dangers that Cadmium exposure posed to young children and passed legislation requiring that children's jewelry not contain more than .0075 of cadmium. The bill before your committee increases the amount of cadmium allowed in children's jewelry and therefore increases their exposure to this toxic heavy metal.

Cadmium is a toxic metal commonly found in nickel-cadmium (Ni-Cad) batteries, paints, metal coatings, and plastics, and is a prevalent environmental contaminant. [1,2,3] Recently, cadmium has been used in making jewelry, often as part of the metal alloys in pendants and charms commonly found in children's jewelry. [1] Manufacturers, particularly those based in India and China, are replacing lead with cadmium as lead has been banned from children's products in many states. [1]

Unfortunately, there is no adequate regulatory system in the United States to ensure chemicals are safe and to prevent toxic substances from being used in children's products. Before using new chemicals in consumer products, current federal regulations do not require manufacturers to prove their safety--the burden falls to consumer to demonstrate that a chemical is toxic [4]. In fact, only 200 of the 80,000 chemicals created over the past thirty years have been adequately tested for their effects on human health [1,3,4].

Cadmium exposure should be limited in children as much as possible to prevent possible health effects as children, and the accumulation of cadmium that may cause diseases later in life. [5] More research is needed to determine the exact effects of cadmium on children; however, there is enough compelling evidence that cadmium is harmful to humans.

When you take into account that small children often put items in their mouths, their exposure risk is increased even more. CPHA maintains that we should not be increasing our youth's exposure to a heavy metal that has been associated with kidney and prostate cancers and hormone-dependent cancers of the breast and endometrium. [6]

There are enormous, public health and economic costs associated with the presence of toxic chemicals and metals in our children's environments. Currently, \$8,508 is spent per person per year on health care in the United States. [7]. Add to this number, which as of November of 2013 was the highest in the world, the additional costs of unemployment or the loss of productivity associated with chronic disease and people should take notice. CPHA believes that phasing out harmful chemicals and metals from children's products may result in the reduction of the incidence of diseases linked with toxic chemicals, reduce overall health care expenditures and improve public health. [1].

CPHA and its broad membership urges members of the General Law Committee to keep existing state regulations on cadmium in children's jewelry as is and not take action suggested within this bill that we believe equals a step backward for Connecticut's children and the state's overall public health.

## References

1. Safer Chemicals. Healthy Families. (2010, January). The Health Case for Reforming the Toxic Substances Control Act. Retrieved from <http://healthreport.saferchemicals.org/>
2. Schwartz, Jackie M. & Woodruff, Tracy J. (2008, September) Shaping Our Legacy: Reproductive Health and the Environment. Retrieved from, University of California, San Francisco, Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences Web site: <http://www.prhe.ucsf.edu/prhe/pubs/shapingourlegacy.pdf>
3. Landrigan, Philip J. (2010, January 16). What Causes Autism? Exploring the Environmental Contribution. Current Opinion in Pediatrics. doi: 10.1097/MOP.0b013e328336eb9a
4. Center for Environmental Health (2008). Oakland, CA, U.S. Web site: [www.ceh.org](http://www.ceh.org)
5. Landrigan Philip J. et al. (2002, July). "Environmental Pollutants and Disease in American Children: Estimates of Morbidity, Mortality and Costs for Lead Poisoning, Asthma, Cancer and Developmental Disabilities." Environmental Health Perspectives, 110 (7). 721-8.
6. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3002210/#!po=78.5714>
7. [http://www.upi.com/Health\\_News/2013/11/13/US-healthcare-Most-expensive-longest-waits-most-red-tape/UPI-30501384398664/](http://www.upi.com/Health_News/2013/11/13/US-healthcare-Most-expensive-longest-waits-most-red-tape/UPI-30501384398664/)

*Both of the following were cited in the article that I cite in #6. It's been a long time since I needed to cite for a paper. Do I cite the article I used or should I cite the article's references ☺*

14. Waalkes MP. Mutat Res. 2003;533(1-2):107-120. doi: 10.1016/j.mrfmmm.2003.07.011. [PubMed] [Cross Ref]
15. McElroy JA, et al. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2006;98(12):869-873. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djj233. [PubMed] [Cross Ref]