

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

February 4, 1964

The meeting was called to order and the sponsors of HCR 9 were introduced to discuss the merits of the resolution. Mr. Dierdorff stated that this resolution proposed to abolish the Budget Session, but to give the people an opportunity to do so; that it is felt the expense doesn't warrant the results. Mr. Crossan stated that at every Budget Session, the legislature tries and sometimes passes bills that are not legal; that he objects to this sort of thing; that he believes it is possible that we need a session every year, but that it should be able to handle general legislation and perhaps be limited as to time. Mr. Beaman stated that the expense of the Budget Sessions has become considerable and that perhaps a general session might be more practical. He stated that the original Budget Session cost about \$200,000 but that now the cost is doubled. There was considerable discussion about the merits of a general session each year and the sponsors of this resolution stated that they would have no objection, but felt that perhaps the Budget Session should be done away with.

Mr. McCall appeared to discuss HCR 10. He stated that there was a great deal of feeling that perhaps the Legislature needed to meet every year but that the Budget Session was wasteful because many of the legislators have little to do because they are limited in the type of legislation they can consider. Mr. Painter, Mr. Cram and Mr. Dixon reiterated what Mr. McCall said. Mr. Cram stated that this is the "jet age" and that government is big business; that perhaps the state needs a session every year but that the Budget Session is not adequate. By discussion it was agreed that 30 days would not be sufficient time and that perhaps a limitation of 60 days would be practical. Mr. Marshall inquired about limiting such a session to only Committee bills and the sponsors agreed that this would not be objectionable.

The Committee adjourned to meet in room 529 to hear proponents to HCR 15. Mr. Mikesic introduced Mike Getto, President of the Hotel & Motel Association, who discussed the advantages, moneywise, of permitting the sale of liquor by the drink. He stated that the State Chamber, and the Chambers of Atchison, Leavenworth, Kansas City and Salina had urged legislation to permit this; that the Governor's Committee on Economic Development pointed out that industry is hampered because they can't offer the hospitality that visitors expect; that he doesn't feel it would creat any

moral problem; he cited the case of Iowa, which state has recently opened establishments to dispense liquor by the drink; that last year they received 4 million dollars in revenue and that this year they expect 5½ million.

Roy McCue of Associated Industries stated that several Kansas groups have had conventions out of state recently because of the hospitality factor; that Kansas should be getting this revenue from Kansas industries; that the Association passed a resolution to the effect that the people should have an opportunity to express themselves on this question. It was established that the legislature would have the power to establish the control if the people voted in favor of this proposition.

It was stated that Idaho, Oregon and Washington had since WWII changed from package stores to liquor by the drink and that traffic deaths had in fact decreased during that time, and that the crime rate had decreased; no claim was made that the change had brought about this decrease, but it was pointed out that certainly it hadn't increased.

Mr. Riddle pointed out the situation of the private key clubs and stated that with the licensing fee in Wichita, the law enforcement officers could now have some control but that in most areas there was no control--age, closing hours, etc. That in Wichita alone there were nearly 100 such clubs and that it seems to be the same everywhere; that these establishments don't even pay for beer licenses because they operate in the private club area.

It was pointed out that we would have more control with this type of thing--that the key clubs are vicious and are uncontrolled.

The chairman stated that tomorrow the opponents would be heard. Meeting was adjourned

MIKE GETTO - LAWRENCE - KCM HOTEL + Motel Assoc.

L. Lew

Town House Hotel KCK.

Pharis

W. M. C. C.

Colonial Motel KCK.

Associated Industries
of Kansas, Inc. - Topeka

Bill Bass Jr

W. Mercer

Pick Kanson - Topeka

Pick Kanson

W. Christie

Holiday Inn South - Top

Kennedy

Ottawa Kans Attorney

House Concurrent Resolution No. 15

By Messrs. MIKESIC and DREILING

A PROPOSITION to amend section 10 of article 15 of the constitution of the state of Kansas, relating to alcoholic beverages.

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, two-thirds of the members elected to the House of Representatives and two-thirds of the members elected to the Senate concurring therein:

SECTION 1. The following proposition to amend the constitution of the state of Kansas is hereby submitted to the qualified electors of the state for their approval or rejection: That section 10 of article 15 of the constitution of the state of Kansas be amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 10. ~~The legislature may provide for the prohibition of intoxicating liquors in certain areas. Subject to the foregoing, the legislature may regulate, license and tax the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, and may regulate the possession and transportation of intoxicating liquors. The open saloon shall be and is hereby forever prohibited~~ *The manufacture, sale, transportation and possession of intoxicating liquor shall be regulated by law.*”

SEC. 2. This proposition shall be submitted to the electors of the state at the general election in the year 1964 for their approval or rejection. The proposed amendment to the constitution shall be published by the secretary of state and printed on the ballot, and shall be voted for or against as provided by law.

SEC. 3. This resolution, if concurred in by two-thirds of the
2 members elected to the house of representatives and two-thirds
3 of the members elected to the senate, shall be entered on the
4 journals, together with the yeas and nays, and the proposition
5 shall be published and submitted to the electors as provided by
6 law; and it shall also be published by the secretary of state in the
7 Budget Session Laws of Kansas for 1964, and be given a chapter
8 number therein.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 16

By MESSRS CLARK and McCALL

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION directing the Kansas legislative council to make a study concerning the advisability of providing for an optional form of county government to be known as county manager form of government, and providing for a report and recommendations thereon.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein: The Kansas legislative council is hereby directed to make a study to determine the advisability of enacting legislation which would authorize an optional form of government to be known as the county manager form of government. The council shall submit its report thereon, together with such recommendations as it may see fit to adopt to the 1965 regular session of the legislature.

Be it further resolved: That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the chairman and to the secretary of the Kansas legislative council.