

SB 372

PA 692 (Vetoed)

1971

Public Personnel & Military Affairs 5

House 5778

Senate 2659 - 2660

↳ Veto Session 311 - 315

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
PERSONNEL
AND
MILITARY
AFFAIRS**

1-148

**1971
Index**

5.
AO
TUESDAY

PUBLIC PERSONNEL & MILITARY AFFAIRS

Fe.16,1971

5

Mr.Foden I also wish to speak in favor of HB5340 and HB6059
cont'd

WmHickey Gentlemen my name is William Hickey from the State Employees Assoc. I would like to speak on HB6509 introduced by Representative Rubin Cohen. This provides for payment of Blue Cross, Major Medical and CMS premiums for retired state employees. At the present time a person retires from state service, he then assumes the full cost of premium payments for Blue Cross, Major Medical and CMS. This can amount to the sum of \$450 to \$500 provided they have young children in the family. The active state employee at the present time, I believe the state pays both for the employee and half for the family. It would be a wonderful thing could be continued into retirement. On HB 5902 which Repr. Elmer Mortenson spoke on, war service credit for state policemen and department of corrections. A state employee can't take his war service time and apply it to his state employee time to get a total of 25 years. He can then retire provided he has the age. The department of corrections and police officers are not so privileged. They put in their 20 years as a state policeman or department of corrections person, and then they can approve this war service time for retirement extra credit only. On HB5894, introduced by Representative Elmer Mortenson it provides for a straight 20 year retirement for state police officers. Again they can come on at age 21 and although supposedly there is a 20 year retirement they can put in 26 or 27 years before being eligible. We would appreciate it greatly if you would see your way clear to correcting this. There is one other bill SB574 concerning 20 year retirement for motor vehicle inspectors. Senator Sanatano who was to speak on this today, was sick last week, and with the permission of Mr. Motto he will appear on Thursday. I appreciate it very much. Thank you.

Repr.Motto. Are there any questions? Thank you. Dr. Moore

Dr.Moore, Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I am James W. Moore, legislative chairman of the Connecticut Employees Association. I know we have quite a few people who wish to speak today and if I spoke on each one of these individual bills that we support, I would probably take up an hour and a half of your time which would not be fair, and I know the committee would feel after awhile that I was a bit redundant about these bills. What I want to do is to list the bills the Conn.State Employees Association are principally interested in and give their support to. You will in the near future receive from us a written summation on each bills that we are concerned with. Right now, I would like to list the bills and make one or two brief remarks concerning the retirement system. The bills the @SEA is supporting either through initiating the bill or being in favor of the bill are HB5124, HB5329, HB5340, HB 5571, HB5585, HB 5770, HB5894..SB 5902SB 5908, HB5912, HB 6059, SB - I believe I referred to 5902 as a SB, that is a HB5902 also HB6060, HB 6301, HB6305, Senate bills 158,161,372,474,and 574. Now as I said before if I was to speak on each one of these I would be here for a long time, and certainly I would wear out my welcome on the first day of the hearings, which is something I do not wish to do. Just briefly most of these bills have to do with retirement, and certainly I agree with the new state treasurer in what he said that our state retirement fund is in a precarious position. This is something of course that we have known for many years, and you people have heard myself and

H-120

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 13
5555-6226**

Mr. Speaker, also on page 11, the third item from the bottom which has previously been passed temporarily, Calendar No. 1428, substitute for S. B. No. 0372, File No. 1212. ad

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Would you remark?

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill takes the cost of living adjustment for state employees, retired state employees that is, and changes it from two, from biennially type adjustment to a yearly adjustment. It has the Finance and Control Commissioner to calculate the cost of living as based on the consumer price index and will have it computed as of July 1, 1972. That means, for this year, he will use the figures that were on the other biennial report. This is a good bill. It gives our retired state employees some sort of an adjustment in their retirement, just as we did for the teachers in the teacher's retirement. This is a good bill and I urge its passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bill is PASSED.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, I now ask the Clerk to return to the bottom of page 7, Calendar No. 1181, substitute for S. B. No. 1675, File No. 992.

THE CLERK:

On page 7, Calendar No. 1181, substitute for S. B. No. 1675, An Act Concerning the Authorization of Bonds of The State to Provide for Parking

**S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 6
2436-2873**

June 1, 1971

21.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, this bill simply states that the employer shall not require the worker to receive medical attention for injuries covered under the Workmen's Compensation Act. After his regular working hours. If the injured employer's working hours overlap or coincide with the doctor's office hours. The purpose is to allow the injured worker to receive medical treatment for his injuries during his regular working hours. I move passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of passage of the bill signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 859, File 1212, Favorable substitute report of the joint standing committee on Appropriations Substitute S.B. 372. An Act Concerning Cost of Living Adjustments in Salaries of Retired State Employees.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, the money is in the Appropriation act on this particular measure. And it directed to the State Retirement Fund. It provides an annual cost of living adjustment in the salaries of retired state employees. The 1967 Supplement of the General Statutes had provided for a bi-annual adjustment. Thus it in effect is indeed a housekeeping measure. I urge its passage.

June 1, 1971

22.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of passage signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

The next item on page 7, Cal. 861, File 1213 Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Appropriation on S.B. 523, An Act Defining Dependent Child For Purposes of Temporary Public Assistance.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I urge the, I move the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, again/^{the}money that this particular measure will cost is in the large budget within the Welfare Department. It makes changes in the Section of the law of the 1969 Supplements. Clarifies the definition of a dependent child for the purposes of temporary public assistance. It makes the same word changes basically as S.B. 203. Except that it makes provisions for the payment of public assistance in a situation where there is partial or total unemployment. I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further?

Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, I'd rise to oppose this bill. Actually under the new law, covering the full time attendance of the secondary school and college and that. This more or less constitutes another form of scholarship. And I believe that we're talking

S-83

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

VOL. 14

PART 8

1-468

SP.SESS

INDEX

August 2, 1971

93

THE CLERK:

The clerk has completed his calendar as marked.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Caldwell.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, there is one more item that we would like to take up today. It is on Page 3, Public Act 692. File No. 1212.

THE CLERK:

Page 3 of your calendar. Fourth item from the bottom of the page. Public Act 692. File No. 1212. Sub. Senate Bill 372. An Act Concerning Cost of Living Adjustments in Salaries of Retired State Employees.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mondani.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, I move repassage of the act.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, this act was passed by this Circle, without I recall, any dissent. It mends the cost of living adjustment in the pension of retired state employees. Currently, there is a three year wait, at which time, the individual who retires, could if the recent past is any record, lose 12, 14, 16 % of purchasing power while he waits for the cost of living. The bill, the original bill passed two years ago, set up for cost of living increases for retired state employees, based on a biennial system. This is before we changed to the annual system where we could review and project.

August 2, 1971

94

SENATOR MONDANI:

This bill would not cost us anything in this biennium because it takes effect July 1, 1972. It puts them on a straight one year basis. That is to say the Comptroller would calculate the rise in the cost of living and then add it on to the pension after this period and go back to those people in 1967 who were ineligible for all others. Current legislation, Mr. President, calls for an adjustment in the biennium not to exceed six percent. In effect this measure really calls for a possible one percent increase, should the cost of living reach that level. Our current figures show that the cost of living is accelerating at a point of 4% per year. If there is any decrease it probably wouldn't mean anything in the program because we are limited to 4%. It could fall below depending on the national trend. I think when these people retire, they retire at a fixed income. It is important that we maintain their purchasing power. That is why I urge passage of the amendment. It would hold their purchasing power, at least to the cost of living should it not exceed 4%. It will not take effect until 1972. It is very difficult to estimate the cost but I would hope Mr. President and members of the circle would see fit to override this veto, take care of those employees who have served us and who have served the State of Connecticut so well, who are now retired and now face the same cost of living as those who are employed do and a chance to increase their income.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hammer.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, Senator Mondani has said has said if this law is passed over the veto, it will not take effect or have any effect during this

SENATOR HAMMER:

biennium and so I recommend we wait until the session February, 1972 so we have time to study the problem again and act on it with more deliberation. I don't even know where it is in the book of vetoes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ives.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the passage of this bill. The State Employment Retirement Fund is not actuarilly sound and any change to this effect will make it that much more out of balance. Private industry as a rule does not adjust retirement salaries and yet the state has been more generous and has been readjusting on a basis longer than one year. The fact that we have done it, does not mean that we should move it to a one year basis which in the long run is going to cost the state a great deal of additional money and the veto should be sustained.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks on the repassage? Senator Burke.

SENATOR BURKE:

Mr. President and Members of the Circle, this bill wouldn't take effect until July 1, 1972 and I also noted that the increase is only one percent. I think it is a good bill and we should override the Governor's veto.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks. Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, the last paragraph of the veto message, "prior to making any substantive changes in retirement acts, these changes should be submitted

SENATOR HOULEY:

a full actuarial review, in order to ascertain the costs to the state and maintain the fund on a sound basis. I merely want to say for the record Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations, did in fact, receive such evidence and when this bill was discussed and presented before us in full debate, this particular portion of the veto message was erroneous in that it was actuarial sound it was actuarially proofed out.

SENATOR MONDANI:

The response to the inquiry received from Senator Hammer that I don't believe that the question of waiting, I don't believe that we should wait unless there is a definite commitment on the part of the people here to vote for such a type of measure. I don't think it is unreasonable. I believe if the cost of living rises these people should benefit by a pension increase which would maintain them, solely maintain them at the level that they retired at, serves as a soundness of the system, that is a separate issue, this bill is not going to have a major effect on that. One way of resolving that is to properly fund the system, put in the cash reserves necessary. It is a thing which we haven't been doing and until we do that this is not going to contribute greatly to the unsoundness. I think the fact that the legislature has not over the past few years, appropriated the proper amount of money. That contributes to the unsoundness of the system.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further. If not, will the Clerk call the roll.
All Senators return to the Chamber for a Roll Call Vote.

August 2, 1971

97

THE CLERK:

An immediate Roll Call Vote is ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

Roll Call on P.A. 692. Sub. S.B. 372. Cost of Living Adjustments for

Retired State Employees.

District	1	Senators	Fauliso	Absent
	2		Smith	Yea
	3		Burke	Yea
	4		Odegard	Nay
	5		Jackson	Yea
	6		Pac	Absent
	7		Alfano	Yea
	8		Rome	Nay
	9		Eddy	Nay
	10		Ciarlone	Yea
	11		Lieberman	Yea
	12		Hammer	Nay
	13		Zajac	Nay
	14		Prete	Yea
	15		Cutillo	Yea
	16		Sullivan	Yea
	17		Buckley	Yea
	18		Crafts	Nay
	19		Murphy	Yea
	20		Cashman	Nay
	21		Gunther	Nay
	22		Macauley	Nay
	23		Caldwell	Yea
	24		Petroni	Nay
	25		Dowd	Absent
	26		Rimer	Nay
	27		Strada	Yea
	28		Rudolf	Nay
	29		Dupont	Yea
	30		Power	Nay
	31		Dinielli	Yea
	32		Ives	Nay
	33		Mondani	Yea
	34		DeNardis	Nay
	35		Houley	Yea
	36		Finney	Nay

The following is the Yea and Nay Vote

Whole Number Voting	33
Necessary for passage	24
Those voting Yea	17
Those voting Nay	16
Those absent and not voting	3

The motion to repress the bill is defeated and the Governor's veto sustained.