

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 4, 1965

The Chairman called the meeting to order and then asked the Committee for permission to introduce a bill and have it rereferred to the Committee. He stated that it was one of the Governor's recommendations dealing with water reservoirs and recreation areas. Mr. Rogers moved that this be done. Motion was seconded by Mr. Meckel and carried unanimously.

Mr. Bell was introduced to discuss H.B. 688. He stated that there was a bill in the Senate (SB 118) but that it didn't have all the provisions that this one did, and that the Senator had no objection to the provisions provided in this bill. He states that this is what the Board of Cosmetology wants and deals with the educational requirements--high school education or equivalent. Miss Jacquart inquired if this might encourage drop outs and Mr. Bell stated that in order to enter school they must be at least 17 and have the equivalent of a high school education and that he felt it would not. Mr. Taylor stated that he had talked to Senator Sebelius who favored this bill and as a matter of fact didn't know that a bill was being introduced in the house, and thought these additional provisions were alright. Miss Jacquart moved for favorable recommendation, which motion was seconded by Mr. Ford and carried with 12 yes votes.

Harlow Brown of Reno discussed his H.B. 789, pointing out the advisability of designating a portion of the ballot as a non-partisan ballot for such occasions as Junior College Board of Regents. After several questions by members of the committee it was decided to consider the bill later.

Mr. Griffith spoke in favor of HCR 510, stating that since the Supreme Court ruling it is important to have such a resolution submitted to the people since the decision has declared the one per county part of the Constitution void; that this would give sufficient room for whatever kind of boundary the legislature might set up; that it would be solely in the hands of the legislature. Mr. Marshall inquired if the Congress should accomplish what they are attempting, if the old constitutional amendment would be re-ratified. Mr. Griffith stated that he didn't think so. The Chairman pointed out that this thing has not been completely settled and therefore, we should wait until it is clear what should be done. Mr. Harder, one of the sponsors of the resolution, stated that the resolution would give sufficient flexibility that it may be done as may be required. After additional discussion it was agreed to defer any action.

Mr. Turner appeared on behalf of H.B. 819, and stated that this proposal deals with collection of interest on idle funds for counties and municipalities. He stated that there is an average of 19 million dollars in Sedgwick County, sometimes amounts of 30 million and more upon which the county is receiving no interest at all. He states that the bill at not less than 1% would provide considerable relief for the taxpayers. Mr. Harms stated that he as County Treasurer of Sedgwick County, had talked with some bankers (Mr. Button and Mr. Pritcher) who stated that they felt that the counties should have some of this investment money. He stated that a certain reserve should be kept on hand but that the rest should draw interest. Mr. Bunten asked if it was permissible to invest county funds in government securities? After numerous questions by members of the Committee, Mr. Marshall asked if this would make it mandatory that the bank pay not less than 1%, and then stated that he objected to that because the bank might not want the money. Mr. Marshall further stated that this would not be permissible because National Banking laws require that on demand deposits, they cannot invest the money.

Mr. Unruh then discussed H.B. 775, describing the situations where a creditor fails to pay and the lender in order to recover must secure the services of an attorney. He states the creditor should be penalized to the extent of the costs and attorney fees. He states that neighboring states have such legislation. After a great deal of discussion, Mr. Unruh, Mr. Woodworth and Mr. Turner were appointed a sub-committee to work on the proposal.

The Chairman stated there would be no meeting tomorrow-- Friday, but that hearings were scheduled for Monday and Thursday of next week.

Meeting was adjourned.