

January 11, 1995

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Wickersham, if I may, I would have a series of questions possibly on how this rule would operate and let me say at the beginning that I'm very happy with the initiative you have taken in terms of dealing with retirement bills and getting the proper kinds of background information for them and even the process of doing this on a two-year cycle. The aspect of this amendment that concerns me is a disadvantage I perceive deriving from this amendment to anybody that would hope to amend a retirement bill on the floor. My experience has been that of all different kinds of legislation the most difficult to amend on this floor is a retirement bill. It's difficult because it's hard to understand in the first place. It's difficult because it's very difficult to communicate that understanding to the rest of the people on the floor of Legislature and it's difficult because you, the amender, do not have the information generally that the Retirement Committee has. And I'm wondering and would like to exchange ideas with you on whether that difficulty on the part of those who wish affect the bill on the floor is not exacerbated by this rule. Part (b) of the rule indicates that no bill will be passed until an actuarial study has been conducted and the results have been reported, no bill shall be passed. So I assume that that means that the retirement for example, let's say the Retirement Committee comes in with a bill, you have your actuarial study, everything is in order, it gets to General File and the body wishes to consider the question of whether the early retirement should be one year or two years or three years or some other aspect of the bill that affects the total amount of benefits is affected by it or would be affected by a particular amendment. I assume the way this is proposed I, as the proposer of the amendment, could go ahead and propose it with the disadvantage of not having any actuarial studies which is kind of currently what happens anyway, but then the bill would not progress from that point or the bill could progress but it could not pass until additional actuarial studies are done in the event that that amendment is adopted by the body? Is that correct?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: That is correct. The amendment could be adopted but the bill couldn't be passed on Final Reading until we had the actuarial study that told us what it cost in its amended form.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, and right now under current processes with regard and current access with regard to the state