

HB 7959

PA 628

1971

Public Personnel

141-143, 145

4

House

5066

1

Senate

3401

1

6

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC  
PERSONNEL  
AND  
MILITARY  
AFFAIRS**

**1-148**

**1971  
Index**

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

TUESDAY

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr, Bitzer,

I am speaking for the Retirement Commission today. You remember 7955. AN ACT CONCERNING ELECTION OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS BY NEW STATE EMPLOYEES. This would provide that employees who had not made an election by any one of the plans in the Retirement System could automatically be in part B and therefore would not go by a six month period and be precluded from ever being a member of the State Employees Retirement Plan. The present situation is hard and this would help to make it more palatable. 7956, this substitutes the word spouse for widow in the plan covering policemen and firemen survivors benefits. There are a couple of police women already covered. It's in line with what is being done in private pensions and has an anti-discrimination laws and we recommend its passage. 7959 is merely a clarification bill there has been some confusion whether we cover disability after employees leave State service and of course the fact is we do not, so we put the words while in State service here for clarification purposes. 7961 provides the teachers who have not made any election will automatically after one month be in the State Employees Retirement Fund, otherwise, as it works now, I think they would be covered for Social Security only, which gives them an opportunity to pick one of the State plans if they fail to join the Teacher's Plan. All four of those bills the Retirement Commission recommends. There is a bill 8228 which has to do with the Medical Board. It provides for increasing the numbers the medical board working with us. We are highly in favor of this bill, they do a fine job, a thorough job and their work load has increased, the number of state employees has increased, they are going to speak for themselves in sympathy with their bill. All these things are pretty good so far but now I come to 8511 where I have been empowered to say a few words on the contrary side of that bill. That kind of coverage, death benefit to the widows and survivors was very difficult to obtain. The State did not want to take the risk, we got an insurance company to do it. The insurance company has a contract that starts on July 1, and ends on June 30th. They set a rate at the beginning of the year we had to know who is in the plan at the beginning of the year. If groups to come in during the year, particularly a large group, it might throw the cost off, they might not be willing to take it at that cost, and there are practical administrative considerations and first we'd have to get the insurance underwriter to agree and it complicates the administration, what we are doing. Thank you.

Rep. Motto,

Are there any questions? Thank you, Mr. Bitzer. Dr. Moore, then Aaron Gersten.

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

TUESDAY

MARCH 23, 1971

Dr. Moore,

Ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, I am James Moore Legislative Chairman of the CSEA. I'd like to speak first on HB-7959 one of those bills Mr. Bitzer just mentioned. There is some question in the wording or question I guess of the intent, and if Mr. Bitzer is still here perhaps he could answer this question. I am referring to Section 1, 921 while you're in State service becomes permanently disabled. My question is; suppose an employee has been injured, is in the hospital, has used up his sick leave and is on a leave of absence and he never does snap out of it and is forced into retirement, now is he considered still in State service, because he is on a leave of absence? There is some question in my mind, I don't know if there is any question in Mr. Bitzer's mind but in that particular question if he could clarify that I would like to have that part cleared up. Now the Committee has listed a number of the bills they were to hear today one mentions optional forms of retirement for State employees and again I would like to go on record as stating vehemently that the present option form of the State employee is not palatable enough for most of the State employees especially if his wife is younger than himself. This makes it very difficult for him to accept the penalty he has when he does retire and those actuarial tables should be reworked again and perhaps by some body other than an insurance actuary because the philosophy of insurance is that they shall lose no money and they must make a profit for stockholders and etc. whereas the philosophy under which a Retirement System operates is that it should break even. So, I recommend to the Committee to have them again consider HB-5585. You don't have it listed today but it is one of the bills before your Committee and it is a plan for the option. I think that if we do things like this we would see the end results would be a dirth of bills to benefit State employees' widows, those whose husbands procrastinated about taking the option plan because it was so costly and then they died before they could do anything about it and so we have bills in here for widows to receive some sort of pension if we had any, and the one that's suggested 5585 calls for additional cost to the State employee, so we are not asking for something free, we just want or ask for a plan which seems to us to be more reasonable. Thank you.

Rep. Motto,

Thank you Dr. Moore. Mr. Bitzer would you care to answer?  
Just answer the first question.

Mr. Bitzer,

While in State service means up to the time that connection with the State is severed altogether. It includes sick leave everything up to complete termination of employment. The other question Mr. Moore raised about factors is a technical question which could be argued at great length.

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

TUESDAY

MARCH 23, 1971

Rep. Motto,

I think it is something we can discuss later and not take up the time of the hearing. Thank you. Mr. Gersten.

Mr. Gersten,

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee my name is Aaron Gersten and I am a practicing attorney in Hartford. I represent a group of Hartford firemen who are here today to enlist your aid in support of HB-744. May I say, while many have signed the registration they do not intend to speak so all those in favor subsequent to my name will not speak and they've asked me to speak on their behalf. HB-744 is entitled AN ACT CONCERNING RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR FOR POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY OF HARTFORD WHO SERVED IN WORLD WAR II. These are dedicated men who are stuck by their employer and are not asking you for anything they could not have gotten 13 years ago because Public Act 521 of the 1957 legislature was an identical act as they are passing now, the only difference being that in 1957 there was a cut-off date. That cut-off date was October 1, 1958, granting if they had been ready with their payments on or before October 1, 1958 and the act before you says that determining war time service for the Retirement System in the City of Hartford as they applied as members of the police and fire departments of that city, the length and service of the personnel of those departments shall be deemed to include their war service during the second World War, Dec. 7, 1941 to Dec. 31, 1946. Even though said members may not have been employed by the City of Hartford at the time of their participation in the second World War provided such member shall have resided in the City not less than two years at the time of his original employment by such department and provided he paid into the Retirement System to which he belongs for each year of his war service a sum equal to 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ % of his first years salary as a city employee with interest as 5% per annum. The 57 Act said that you must take that payment on or before Oct. 1, 1958. Many of the men were just getting started with families, some were in debt, some of them had to support parents some of them had illness in the family and as a result not all of them could take advantage of the provisions of Special Act 521 so due to arrangements in 1969 they afforded the policemen of the City of Hartford by Special Act 242 they allowed them to pay into a Retirement System 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ % of their first years salary provided they did that on or before Oct. 1, 1969 and all we are asking is that to give the firemen the same rights you gave the policemen in 1969. I am not asking for anything they could not get years ago, but because of the problems that they faced at the time they just could not afford it. They are now asking you give them that opportunity once again and the cut-off date being Feb. 1, 1972. I most urgently urge your favorable support for HB-744. Thank you.

TUESDAY

MARCH 23, 1971

Rep. Motto, Thank you Doctor. Damon Shingleton followed by John Bannon and Howard Reynolds.

Mr. Shingleton, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, Damon Shingleton I'm the Director of the Conn. State Employees Council 16. I just want to speak briefly on a couple of bills that you have before you today. I would say that we completely agree with Dr. Bachman's testimony . There is a great need for additional help in the Medical Retirement Board. Many individuals who are handicapped must wait for long periods of time because the Board is so over worked and certainly HB-8228 is a very good bill and we would hope the Committee gives it favorable consideration. On HB-7959 basically it is the intent of the bill to clarify the intent of Retirement and not the change of the option after retirement . We would support the bill but we could see how the bill as written could create problems. We question whether an individual who has a handicap when he comes into State service whether or not he would be eligible to get his retirement under this section and if he did come down with a condition which would worsen the handicap which he already had when hired by the State. We support HB-7955 we feel it has a void in retirement law that individuals who come into State service don't really know what option they should take. Many cases wind up with only a portion of the retirement and certainly this would be a move in the right direction. Thank you very much.

Rep. Motto, Any questions? Thank you Damon. John Bannon.

Mr. Bannon, Gentlemen, and members of the Committee, my name is John Bannon President of the Conn. State Federation of Teachers. AFL-CIO. We would like to oppose HB-8510. We feel that this bill would cause another crisis for the Teacher's Retirement System by another delay of funds and will not keep faith with those who have paid into the system for many years. What is actually going to take place we are afraid is that with the deficit that is facing our State financial theme for people in the legislature and in other places to look for sources of funds. We would hope that after the bonding procedure which was instigated in 1969, we would hope that any further raise on the Teacher Retirement Fund would cease. If this continues to go on in any form what will eventually happen is we will be in the exact same position the State Employees' Retirement Fund is in and eventually we will just be creating more problems for the State of Connecticut and eventually we will have another bankrupt situation facing the teachers of the State and these teachers who have been paying in for many years will not appreciate the fact that their money would be going down the drain . So what we are asking you is this Committee report unfavorable HB-8510 as another way of assisting another situation that would cause untold harm to the Teacher's Retirement System. The teachers would like

**H-118**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 11  
4831-5162**

Saturday, June 5, 1971

11

Page 16, calendar 1169, house Bill 7903, file 1284.

Calendar 1170, substitute for House Bill 7959, file 1292.

Calendar 1171, substitute for House Bill 8228, file 1294.

Page 17, Calendar 1217, substitute for House Bill 7686,  
file 1349.

Page 18, Calendar 1234, House Bill 6837, file 1353.

Calendar 1242, substitute for House Bill 6448, file 1377.

Calendar 1245, Substitute for House Bill 7974, file 1382.

Page 19, Calendar 1263, substitute for House Bill 5561,  
file 1431.

Calendar 1273, substitute for House Bill 5247, file 1429.

Calendar 1274, substitute for House Bill 6512, file 1428.

Page 20, Calendar 1299, House Bill 5147, file 1437.

Page 21, Calendar 1308, substitute for House Bill 5895,  
file 1463.

Calendar 1311, substitute for House Bill 5953, file 1445.

Calendar 1312, substitute for House Bill 6123, file 1468.

Calendar 1316, substitute for House Bill 6292, file 1456.

Page 22, Calendar 1322, substitute for House Bill 6447,  
file 1497.

Calendar 1324, House Bill 6525, file 1475.

Page 24, Calendar 1379, substitute for House Bill 9229,  
file 1576.

Page 25, Calendar 1383, substitute for House Bill 7744,  
file 1573.

Page 28, Calendar 1422, substitute for Senate Bill 240,

S-82  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1971

VOL. 14  
PART 7  
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 72

## THE SENATE AT 10:35 P.M., RECESSED

## AFTER RECESS

The Senate was called to order at 10:58 P.M., Senator DeNardis in the Chair.

## THE CHAIR:

If I may make this announcement, Senator Caldwell is about to list a long number of bills, by number. And it is extremely important that we have quiet in the Chamber, so there is no confusion as to the bills that he will list. I ask your cooperation.

## SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, I have a list of bills by numbers, to read. I move that we accept the joint committees favorable reports and acceptance of the bills, as follows: Cal. No. 1326, House Bill 7455, File 1256; File No. 1327, House Bill 7686, File 1349; Cal 1328, House Bill 7710, File 820; Cal 1329, House Bill 7744, File 1573, Cal. 1331, House Bill 7903, File 1284; C l. 1332, House Bill 7959, File 1292; Cal 1333, House Bill 7974, File 1382; Cal 1334, House Bill 8033, File 931; Cal 1335, House Bill 8182, File 979; C<sup>a</sup>l. 1336, House Bill 8228, File 1294; Cal. 1337, House Bill 8284, File 899; C l 1338, House Bill 8683, File 591; CAL. 1340, House Bill 8931 File 123; CAL. 1341, House Bill 8936, File 832; Cal. 1342, House Bill 8967, File 1072; Cal. 1343, House Bill 9025, File 953; Cal. 1345, House Bill 9229, File 1576; Cal. 1346, House Bill 9231, File 1451; CAL. 1347, House Bill 9327; File 704; Cal. 1348, House Bill 9251, File 1574, Cal. 1349, Senate Bill 825; C<sub>2</sub>l. 259, Senate Bill 989, File 291; Cal. 695, Senate Bill 1700, File 990; C l. 732, Senate Bill 458, File 1052; CAL. 139, House Bill 7447, File 104; CAL. 166, House Bill 6409, File 136; Cal. 1363, House Bill 9194, File 1634; C<sup>a</sup>l. 1364, House Bill 5231