

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

S.B. 406	PA 174	1969
House - 2213, 2214, 2293, 2295		4
Senate - 1312-1313		2
Public Personnel - 140, 142, 143		3

**LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY**

9p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

H-99

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

HOUSE

**PROCEEDINGS
1969**

**VOL. 13
PART 5**

2065-2591

Thursday, May 1, 1969

26.

677, Substitute for House Bill 5314, file 700. Calendar 678, Substitute for House Bill 6088, file 701. Calendar 679, Substitute for House Bill 8136, file 702. Then, second from the bottom, Calendar 682, Substitute for House Bill 5558, file 728. Calendar 683, Substitute for House Bill 8239, file 730. To the top of page 10, Calendar 684, Modified Senate Bill 1001, file 487. Calendar 685, Senate Bill 841, file 490. Skipping one, Calendar 687, Senate Bill 598, file 488. Calendar 688, Senate Bill 599, file 479. Skipping one, Calendar 690, Senate Bill 581, file 480. Calendar 691, Senate Bill 1508, file 495. To the top of page 11, Calendar 692, Modified Senate Bill 167, file 196 and 651. Calendar 693, Senate Bill 929, file 486. Skipping one, Calendar 695, Senate Bill 1091, file 513. Calendar 696, Modified Senate Bill 927, file 477. Calendar 697, Senate Bill 68, file 421. Calendar 698, Senate Bill 120, file 497. Calendar 699, Substitute for Senate Bill 1543, file 498. To the top of page 12, second from the top, Calendar 701, Senate Bill 219, file 113. Calendar 702, Senate Bill 220, file 114. Calendar 703, Senate Bill 490, file 115. Calendar 704, Senate Bill 869, file 116. Calendar 705, Senate Bill 1018, file 117. Calendar 706, Senate Bill 1055, file 118. Calendar 707, Senate Bill 1239, file 286. To page 13, second from the top, Calendar 710, file 511. Skipping one, Calendar 712, Raised Senate Bill 1524, file 476. Calendar 713, Senate Bill 406, file 502. Calendar 714, Modified Senate Bill 790, file 520. Calendar 715, Substitute for Senate Bill 1040, file 335.

MBS

Thursday, May 1, 1969

27.

MR. SPEAKER:

MBS

Does that complete the list? You have heard the list as read by the gentleman from the 78th. Do I hear any objection to placing on the Consent Calendar?

THOMAS J. DONNELLY, JR., 46th District:

Mr. Speaker, I object to Calendar 697.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the gentleman please say what page.

THOMAS J. DONNELLY, JR., 46th District:

I'm sorry. Page 11, Calendar 697, Senate Bill 68, file 421. I want to request that it be removed from that Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

So ordered. Any further objection?

PAUL V. HAYDEN, 83rd District:

I rise not to make an objection. Page 10, I think the word should be Pawcatuck rather than Pawtucket. On page 10, Calendar 686, Senate Bill 610, second line, transferring of the Pawtucket Fire District....

JOHN F. PAPANDREA, 78th District:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. That matter was not placed on the Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'd rule the gentleman out of order on that. Any objection to those read off? If not, the Clerk will put them on the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Tuesday, May 6, 1969

Page 6

File No. 699. Calendar No. 677, Sub. for H.B. No. 5314. File No. 700. Calendar No. 678, Sub. for H.B. No. 6088, File No. 701. Calendar No. 679, Sub. for H.B. No. 8136, File No. 702. Calendar No. 682, Sub. for H.B. No. 5558, File No. 728. Calendar No. 683, Sub. for H.B. No. 8239, File No. 730. Calendar No. 684, M.S.B. No. 1001, File No. 487. Calendar No. 690, S.B. No. 581, File No. 480. Calendar No. 691, S.B. No. 1508, File No. 495. Calendar No. 693, S.B. No. 929, File No. 486. Calendar No. 695, S.B. No. 1091, File No. 513. Calendar No. 696, M.S.B. No. 927, File No. 477. Calendar No. 698, S.B. No. 120, File No. 497. Calendar No. 701, S.B. No. 219, File No. 113. Calendar No. 702, S.B. No. 220, File No. 114. Calendar No. 703, S.B. No. 490, File No. 115. Calendar No. 704, S.B. No. 869, File No. 116. Calendar No. 705, S.B. No. 1018, File No. 117. Calendar No. 706, S.B. No. 1055, File No. 118. Calendar No. 707, S.B. No. 1239, File No. 286. Calendar No. 712, R.S.B. No. 1524, File No. 476. Calendar No. 713, S.B. No. 406, File No. 502. Calendar No. 714, M.S.B. No. 790, File No. 520. Calendar No. 715, Sub. for S.B. No. 1040, File No. 435. Calendar No. 716, S.J.R. No. 99, Calendar No. 717, S.H.R. No. 100. Calendar No. 718, S.J.R. No. 101. Calendar No. 719, S.J.R. No. 102. Calendar No. 720, S.J.R. No. 103. Now, Mr. Speaker, call attention to the three matters which were initially placed on the Calendar for action today. On page 23, under "Matters Returned from Legislative Commissioner" - Calendar No. 467,

dem

Tuesday, May 6, 1969

Page 10

MR. SPEAKER:

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

REP. SPIEGEL - 126th D.

To ask that a Consent matter be removed from the items just enumerated by Mr. Papandrea and passed retaining.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you please state the item.

REP. SPIEGEL - 126th D.

Calendar No. 672,

MR. SPEAKER:

Your objection is noted. The item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and without object be retained until tomorrow's regular Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 78th has moved that the items enumerated, as appearing on the Consent Calendar, be passed in the case of bills or adopted in the case of resolutions. All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Those opposed? The bills are passed and the resolutions adopted.

REP. PAPANDREA - 78th D.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule No. 47, I move that the following items be placed on our Consent Calendar. Calendar No. 740, Sub. for H.B. No. 6230, File No. 804. Calendar No. 741, Sub. for H.B. No. 7252, File No. 805. Calendar No. 742, Sub. for H.B. No. 8426, File No. 806. Calendar No. 743, Sub. for H.B. No. 5298, File No. 807. Calendar No. 746, Sub. for

dem

S-70

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1969

VOL. 13

PART 3

944 - 1473

April 24, 1969

Page 55

Receiving Welfare Assistance, or Families of Limited Resources Being Displaced from Their Homes by Government Action. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

FAVORABLE REPORTS FROM THE CALENDAR:

Cal. No. 513. File No. 501. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on General Law. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 683.

An Act concerning Notices in Cases of Bulk Transfers.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This will simply amend sub-section 42a-6106 of the general statutes. And require that there will be a filing fee of three dollars as well as information outlined in sub-section 1 of the same statute. I urge the passage, this was at the request of the Secretary of State.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage? All those in favor indicate by saying, "aye". Opposed? Ayes have it; bill is passed.

CAL. NO. 514. FILE NO. 502. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Public Personnel. Senate Bill No. 406. An Act concerning the Date of Participation in the Connecticut Municipal Employees' Retirement System When Such Participation is Effectad by Collective Bargaining Agreement.

SENATOR BARBATO:

I move for acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This is merely a housekeeping bill

April 24, 1969

Page 56

it allows the, to square away the Municipal Employment system retirement system when effected by collective bargaining. I think it is a good bill and should pass.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill. Those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed? Ayes have it; bill is passed. CAL. NO. 515 FILE NO. 328. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Banks. House Bill No. 6418. An Act concerning Sale of Assets by Savings and Loan Associations.

SENATOR HICKEY:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This would permit Savings and Loan Associations to belong to State Bank and Trust Companies and Mutual Savings Banks. Selling assets to any other banks or institutions, to Savings and Loan Associations.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill. All those in favor indicate by saying, "aye". Opposed? Bill is passed. CAL. NO. 516. FILE NO. 334. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Cities and Boroughs. House Bill No. 7637. An Act providing a Pension for Mathias J. Paradis of Norwich.

SENATOR PALMER:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill merely permits the City of Norwich to pay a pension to one of its long

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

PUBLIC
PERSONNEL

1969

26
eck
TUESDAY

PUBLIC PERSONNEL

MARCH 4, 1969

the section dealing with contributions by the municipality.

S.B. 404 - This bill does 3 things. (1) If a member transfers from a municipality in Fund A to one in Fund B, then at eventual retirement he receives Fund B benefits for his entire service, including the years when only Fund A contributions were paid by the first municipality. The bill makes it clear that the second municipality is liable for the cost of the increases in benefits above what the first municipality had paid for. (2) When benefits are increased, the present law provides that the cost of applying the increase to previous years' service may be spread over the remainder of 30 years dating from the time when the municipality first joined. For those who joined in the early years of the Fund, that time is now becoming short. The bill gives the alternative of paying over a period of 20 years from the time of the increase in benefits. (3) The bill permits the charge per member for administration expense to be varied between Funds A and B. For instance, a change in the law affecting only one of the Funds may require an actuarial study for that Fund only.

S.B. 405 - Section 7-442a permits transfer of retirement credit between municipalities in the municipal Fund, but seems to imply that the employee must go immediately from one participating municipality to another. Suppose that several towns form a health district, that one of them is in the municipal Fund, and that the employees of its health department are transferred to the new district when it comes into being. The new district requires several months to complete this process for joining the Municipal Fund, and the transferred employees therefore lose their credit for their service before the transfer. This bill preserves that credit if the employee becomes a member of the Fund as an employee of the new district within 2 years after leaving the service of the former municipality.

S.B. 406 - This clarifies the date of participation in the municipal Fund when it is effected by collective bargaining agreement rather than by referendum. A minimum three months waiting period is provided, the same as when participation is by referendum, in order to give the Retirement Commission time to calculate the required contributions.

S.B. 407 - A recent amendment to the federal Social Security Act gives a municipality the option of including its firemen in Social Security. To extend this option to Connecticut municipalities, if it is desired to do so, this amendment to state law is needed. The federal law does not give any right of choice to the individual fireman; the municipality

28
eck
TUESDAY

PUBLIC PERSONNEL

MARCH 4, 1969

testify on all the bills that appear to be under the subject matter of either municipal employees retirement fund or municipal employees generally which have been referred to your Committee. H.B. 5807 has been referred to your Committee and it was introduced by Rep. Clark and deals with the subject matter of granting credit toward retirement, or credit for retirement purposes, to members of Fund B of the Connecticut Mutual Retirement Fund. I would submit to the Committee, as a previous speaker pointed out, the City of Bridgeport and the employees of the City of Bridgeport represent the bulk of the Fund, and the City of Bridgeport, the employer in this case, has sponsored a similar bill #6425 which has been referred to the Cities and Boroughs Committee. In this bill it is suggested that Bridgeport City employee members of Fund B be granted war-time credit, or credit for retirement for those years or months during which they served in the military service during time of war. Our organization would like to go on record at this time in favor of H.B. 5807, for that reason. As another speaker pointed out to the Committee, H.B. 6968 deals with collective bargaining for government employees, and is also before this Committee. I understand from what the Committee says that this is not being heard today, but we would also at this time wish to register our position to H.B. 6968. Is H.B. 5320 participating in politics by governmental employees.....We had that one last week? Its very difficult to follow, Senator, with the bills listed by subject matter rather than by the bill number. S.B. 401 seems to simply represent technical changes and our Union would support it. S. B. 402 also appears to be simple technical changes and our Union would wish to be registered in favor of it. The same thing is true of #403 and S.B. 404 and #405. S.B. 406 would in effect, as we understand it, change the existing law which simply provides that where there is a conflict between the provisions of the municipal employees retirement act and the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement, then those provisions of that collective bargaining act shall be....shall prevail, and through this provision in the existing law, the number of cities have negotiated a change from Fund A to Fund B and have brought the members of that bargaining unit under the plan...under Fund B. We have been able to accomplish this, we think, with the minimum amount of interference in the administrative procedures of the Retirement Commission and quite frankly we see no reason at all for any change. If there is going to be a change, we certainly ought to be told what specific procedures the Retirement Commission must complete before participation in either Fund A or Fund B can be made

29
ECK
TUESDAY

PUBLIC PERSONNEL

MARCH 4, 1969

effective. It is our best judgment that at this time there are no procedures which the Commission must complete before participation becomes effective which would cause a delay in the implementation or the effective date of participation. For this reason we would oppose S.B. 406. We would at this time wish to register very vigorous opposition to S.B. 407 which is the one bill on which Mr. Hoskins did speak. The history of the firefighters, not only in Connecticut but throughout this nation, with respect to Social Security is that we think Social Security is a fine principle, a fine concept, but it has no meaningful application to firefighters, and for this reason we are very vigorously opposed, and have throughout the years, inclusion of firefighters in the Social Security system. I would respectfully submit that Mr. Hoskins is somewhat in error when he suggests that the only reason why firefighters are not personally covered by Social Security in the State of Connecticut, or why Social Security is not available to firefighters in Connecticut is not simply because the federal law prohibited such inclusion in the last..... but additionally and I think more importantly the reason was that the firefighters were personally opposed to such inclusion, and we remain vigorously opposed at this time and we would urge with all the vigor at our command that S.B. 407 be rejected. We respectfully submit that we have enough difficulty now in working out an effective and meaningful relationship with our employer now under the perfect conditions without adding a new problem, and we would again submit that S.B. 407 if it were to be adopted would add a new dimension to our problem and increase them thereby. S.B. 410 represents merely technical changes as we understand it and we would support it. There are a number of other bills which.....which I would like to talk to the Committee on at some future date. I realize the hour is late and I've taken up a considerable amount of your time. The only two other bills that I would like to speak to the Committee on although there are a number of others evidently before you that affect our interests, but the two that I would want to speak to you about are S.B. 6965 and S.B. 7314, both dealing with (these are House Bills) the heart disease and hypertension presumption statute for policemen and firefighters. The statute which establishes this presumption has been on the books in one form or another since 1953. It has been amended on a number of occasions and most of the amendments have been designed to firmly establish that this presumption...that a fireman or policeman who entered his respective service, passed a physical examination with no evidence of heart disease or hypertension and who subsequently was disabled or died as a result of heart disease or hypertension would be presumed to have suffered his disability in line of duty. The concept upon which this presumption was