

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 2, 1965

The meeting was called to order and Mrs. Graham and Mr. Loux were introduced to discuss H.B. 711. Mrs. Graham stated that it was felt that public office is a "trust" and that the public is entitled to know if their legislator has a conflict of interest. Several members inquired of these sponsors if they would have to list every client and source and amount of income. It was established that an attorney in private practice (not a firm) might have to do this as the bill is written, but they stated that they wanted very broad application.

The Chairman inquired if anything had been accomplished on H.B. 727 and Mr. Unruh presented a proposed amendment, describing certain types of vehicles. Mr. Unruh, after discussion and answering questions, moved the adoption of the amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brown of Pott. and carried with a vote of 9 to 3.

Mr. Shapiro appeared to discuss H.B. 719, which proposed changes in the travel reimbursement for state employees, both in and out of state. He presented figures, attached, which show how the present law applies and how the proposal would affect the state both from an administrative and financial standpoint. He states that he believes it will cost the state some more money but that the employees are coming out the loser at the present time.

Mr. Euler appeared to comment on H.B. 681, and stated that this deals only with rural water districts, and endeavors to give some measure of uniformity....to the law.

Mr. Finney was introduced to discuss H.B. 713, and stated that it represents the thinking of a great many Kansans; that it would create an advisory committee of 30 members with a broad background. He introduced Marion Marshall of Winfield, an attorney, who stated that the idea grew out of the Citizens Federal Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental relations; that the Commission would be completely bi-partisan and that it would be a continuing effort without overlap. Mr. Turner inquired if this could not be set up under the Legislative Council, as a sort of "expanded" program there? Mr. Finney and Mr. Marshall answered questions of committee members.

With regard to H.B. 736, Mr. Doyen wondered if it was a big enough issue to be bothered with. Regarding H.B. 583, Mr. Doyen discussed (along with Mr. Turner) for all practical purposes, a new bill dealing with deductions on the County level and broadening

out into cities and other governmental levels. Much discussion was had as to the possibilities and results of such legislation, opening the bookkeeping systems up to deductions for various contributions of employees. Mr. Mikesic stated that the bill was drafted to simply allow County Governments to deduct an amount for group hospitalization and health insurance, and that he would like to keep it that way without complicating it with these other deductions. Mr. Bunten stated that he had a lot of pressure from people in his district to not legislate this; that even though the department heads might say they were not forcing the issue, the employee would feel the pressure if a quota was set at a certain figure, and none of us know the circumstances of such people and we should not pass such legislation. Mr. Brown of Reno stated that the bill could read "upon written request by the employee" the deduction could be made and Mr. Bunten felt that employees could still feel pressured to make a written request.

The Chairman announced that a public hearing would be held on Thursday afternoon, March 11th for the proponents of H.B. 720.

Meeting was adjourned.